NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCXXXIII.

AUGUST, 1908.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

BY THE LATE HENRY LOOMIS NELSON. REVISED BY THE LATE DANIEL S. LAMONT.

For several years before his death, Grover Cleveland was recognized by most of his fellow countrymen as the first citizen of the land. He was an eminent product of democratic institutions. He did not in his youth possess the advantages of wealth, nor did he suffer any of its disadvantages. The circumstances of his immediate family were narrow; he had not the money with which to pay for a college education, nor had he the time to earn one; but he was brought up in a wholesome domestic atmosphere, with parents of intellectual force and of some education. In his earliest days he was a member of a household which knew neither poverty nor riches, and in his later youth he dwelt in the home of an uncle who had sufficient of the world's goods to give to himself and his young guest comfort, even luxury, and that in the society of men of power and of position in the State and the Nation. The youth was not unfortunate in the beginning of his life, which was that of the normal American boy.

Mr. Cleveland was born at Caldwell, Essex County, New Jersey, on the 18th of March, 1837. His father, who was the Presbyterian minister of the town, was born at Norwich, Connecticut, where the grandfather of the subject of this sketch had

Copyright 1908, by The North American Review Publishing Company All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

followed the occupation of watchmaker. On the father's side, Mr. Cleveland was of English stock; on his mother's side he was partly of Irish blood. His mother was Anna Neal, the daughter of an Irishman who was a bookseller and publisher in Baltimore. But, as so often happens in this country of mingled and mingling races, this Irish blood was not pure, for the mother's mother was Barbara Real, a German Quakeress, of Germantown, Pennsylvania.

The boy was baptized Stephen Grover, in honor of the father's predecessor in the Caldwell pastorate, but the first name was dropped by Mr. Cleveland in early life. In 1841, the family moved to Fayetteville, then to Clinton, then to Holland Patent, all in New York.

In Holland Patent, Grover Cleveland grew up. Here his father died in 1853, when this son was sixteen years of age. There were eight other children, and the mother was left in such circumstances as are commonly the lot of widows of country pastors. Like many other such widows in this country, too, she bore her ills with dignity and courage, and nobly did her duty by her young family. The affectionate remembrance and the high honor in which she was held by her famous son are shown in a letter which he wrote to his brother on the day when he was chosen Governor of New York. Said he: "If mother were here, I should be writing to her, and I feel as if it were time to write to some one who will believe what I write." And again, in the course of the same letter, Mr. Cleveland wrote: "Do you know that if mother were alive I should feel safer? I have always thought her prayers had much to do with my success."

Mr. Cleveland had the usual schooling of the country, and had prepared to enter Hamilton College, but his father's death compelled him to take up the task of bread-winning. He had been a clerk in a country store at Fayetteville before his father died. Now, when he was seventeen years old, he became an assistant to his brother, who was the principal of the boys' and men's department of the New York Institution for the Blind. At the end of a year he went to Buffalo to study law. His boyhood had been circumscribed, his energies had been bounded, his teaching had been meagre. It is likely that under like circumstances in any other country the family would have suffered want, but it is doubtful if the mother and her children ever knew by expe-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rience what such suffering meant. The boy had passed a wholesome boyhood, and his instruction, small though it was, had been intellectually and morally sound.

He spent his years in Buffalo in easy circumstances. He had started from Holland Patent to go to Cleveland, Ohio. He was emigrating to that part of the country, which was then the West. His uncle, Lewis H. Allen, lived in Buffalo and stopped his nephew on the journey. In Mr. Allen's fine house overlooking the Niagara River Mr. Cleveland passed the days of his apprenticeship to the bar. Buffalo was an intellectual, political and social centre. Millard Fillmore was its first citizen, while at the bar were some of the strongest lawyers of the State. In this intellectual and social atmosphere Mr. Cleveland began his active career. He was always a favorite of the best people, and was one of them. Following the instincts of their kind, his partisan opponents, when he first became the candidate of his party for President, undertook to class him with those whom good society refuses to recognize; but, in truth, he lived with the best, and was, from the beginning of his professional career, a successful lawyer. He was also a man of mark in the community, one of the best citizens of the town, ready to do his civic duty, a patriot who believed profoundly in the responsibilities and duties of every one who enjoys the blessings and privileges of American citizenship. In his profession he was not ambitious of a great practice; in his civic and in his public life he was always moved by a high moral purpose. He was once Sheriff of Erie County for the purpose of gaining the opportunity and the means for securing a better legal education than he could gain in the practice of the profession; for, though he did not seek great gains, he desired to perform his tasks as well as possible. He took advantage of the opportunities and employed the means thus acquired for this purpose. He had been Assistant District Attorney and an efficient prosecuting officer. He afterwards gained such a position at the bar that on the death of Mr. Lanning, the very able counsel of the New York Central and Hudson River Railroad, Mr. Cleveland was invited to be his successor. He declined the invitation for the reason that his practice gave him sufficient for his wants, and he did not wish to tie himself to the service of such an exacting client. He advised the employment of the young men who had been Mr. Lanning's

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

partners, but there was objection to them because of their youth and consequent lack of experience. With characteristic generosity, Mr. Cleveland then offered to accept the retainer of the railroad company until the young men could secure a senior member for their firm who would be a counsel satisfactory to the corporation. During the short time when he thus represented the company, its legal business was admirably performed; and this I have from the then president of the railroad, himself a lawyer and a leader of the Republican party.

During his novitiate he had acquired property worth, probably, about $100,000. This property consisted of houses and land in the city of Buffalo. It is necessary to mention this because it has been alleged by malicious, and has been repeated by ignorant, persons that Mr. Cleveland entered public life an unsuccessful and impecunious man. His position in Buffalo, on the contrary, was characteristic of successful Americans and of American social life.

In 1881, when Mr. Cleveland was forty-four years old, the time came when high public office was bestowed upon him. He was chosen Mayor of Buffalo by the largest majority ever before given to any candidate in the city. He had been the candidate of his party, and he was always a partisan Democrat. He believed in the principles of the party which leaned on the plain people, consulted primarily their interests, and trusted them. In his speech of acceptance and in his inaugural address he emphasized what was the guiding principle of his public career. In the first he said: "When we consider that public officials are the trustees of the people and hold their places and exercise their powers for the benefit of the people, there should be no higher inducement to a faithful and honest discharge of public duty." In the second he said: "We hold the money of the people in our hands, to be used for their purposes and to further their interests as members of the municipality; and it is quite apparent that, when any part of the funds which the taxpayers have thus intrusted to us are diverted to other purposes, or when, by design or neglect, we allow a greater sum to be applied to any municipal purpose than is necessary, we have, to that extent, violated our duty."

The administration of the office of Mayor, thus begun, was soon to attract the attention of the State and then of the nation.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Amid all the American cities of the time, Buffalo possessed a Mayor who illustrated, in the discharge of his duties, the highest type of American common sense, American honesty and character, American courage and American plainness of speech. It is true that these virtues are not peculiar to our country, except, perhaps, the last; but the denial that they are to be found in American public men has made it well to emphasize the fact that in this country, more than in any other, are men unused to public life who, when the responsibility is thrown upon them, apply to daily civic duties the loftiest civic virtues. As Mayor, Mr. Cleveland served the city with a single purpose. He vetoed improper appropriations. He drew the line between public duty and private charity. He refused to permit the Aldermen to spend the city's money for the observance of Decoration Day, because the money had not been taken from the taxpayers for that purpose; and he headed a private and sufficient subscription. It was a lesson teaching the difference between a public object and a private object. He attacked the vultures who had grown fat on corrupt contracts. In public addresses he gave evidence of his high idealism. At the semi-centennial of the founding of the city he said: "We boast of our citizenship to-night. But this citizenship brings with it duties not unlike those we owe our neighbor and our God. . . . He who indolently cares not who administers the government of his city will find that he is living falsely, and in the neglect of his highest duty."

He had been Mayor of Buffalo for less than a year when he was nominated by the Democratic party for Governor of New York. Mr. Cleveland's fame had grown by the manner in which he had administered his municipal office, and this fame was non-partisan. His following in Buffalo consisted of the good citizens of both parties. His political enemies were also, impartially, the bad citizens of both parties. He was the Mayor of the city, and they naturally desired to have a Mayor of a party; it mattered not which party, for a party hack is a better mayor for the corrupt men of the opposition than is a good mayor for either party. The Democratic party had been torn into factions by fights with Tammany. The New York County Democracy had, in 1879, driven Tammany to revolt. This organization was determined to prevent its city and county opponents, by an alliance with the "Up-State" Democrats, from ruling the State.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

They had bolted the nomination of Lucius Robinson, and had compassed his defeat. The New York City organization was now, in 1882, fronting the opposition of the Brooklyn, or Kings County, organization led by Mr. Hugh McLaughlin. The rival candidates for the nomination for Governor were Roswell P. Flower and Henry W. Slocum. It was an important year, for it was evident that the national Democrats had an opportunity which, however, they might ruin by internal discord and strife. The dissensions in the cities gave to the County Democracy and their country allies their opportunity. No shrewder and abler politicians ever managed party affairs in New York than Mr. William C. Whitney and Mr. Daniel Manning. They were the leaders of the County Democracy, a name synonymous in New York City with the party of Tilden. This party, or the Democratic party of thirty years ago, when it was led by the Tilden men, was the party of promise; and whenever this party, or this faction of the party, dominated in State politics, the Democrats carried the day. The County Democracy, or the friends of Tilden, under the advice of Mr. Whitney and Mr. Manning, took up the cause of Mr. Cleveland, who was first named by the people of Buffalo. Tammany, facing defeat from Brooklyn, yielded to its old enemies, and supported Mr. Cleveland. He was nominated on the third ballot. His nomination was the successful result of a movement to defeat both Tammany and Kings County, at the same time to harmonize the party, and to name a candidate who might be elected. As events demonstrated, the Democrats had made the best nomination possible. Mr. Cleveland's name, owing to his services as Mayor of Buffalo, appealed to the people of the State. The Republican party was torn to pieces. Not only in New York, but throughout the country, its factional strife had reaped the usual consequences of such contentions. The party was actually split in two, and the election of a Democratic President in 1884 was practically assured if the party, in choosing its candidate, would forget its folly of 1880 and return to its wisdom of 1876. In New York, the Blaine men were the bitter enemies of the Conkling men, while the Conkling men had also come to be the enemies of President Arthur. Mr. Arthur forced the nomination of Judge Folger against the angry protests of Conkling, and the way was open to Mr. Cleveland to the Governorship.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It was a singular characteristic of Mr. Cleveland's political career that he was never elected to any office, except, perhaps, that of Sheriff, by a purely partisan vote. In every one of his campaigns in which he was successful he received the votes of Independents and Republicans. He was a party man in his political thoughts and conceptions; and, while he was never a slave of organization, he preferred the cause of his party if that cause was in harmony with what he conceived to be its principles. True as he was to principle, however, he was known to be firmly devoted to the interests of the whole community, city or State, in administering the public business; to be wholly unselfish; to be a devoted servant of the law, absolutely pure; and as sternly courageous as were the unbending Connecticut Puritans of his paternal stock. So the people who were discontented with the quarrelling factions of the Republican party voted for Mr. Cleveland, and he was elected Governor of the State by the wonderful majority of 193,000.

It was on the first day of 1883, one year after his inauguration as Mayor of Buffalo, that Mr. Cleveland was inaugurated as Governor of New York. In this one year of public service, Mr. Cleveland's reputation had attained to national proportions, and he was recognized as one worthy to be considered as a candidate for the Presidency. His Governorship was marked, as was his Mayoralty, by the traits of character, the capacity, the industry and the reverence for the law of the land and for the spirit of that law, which have marked him as easily the best endowed, the best equipped and the most effective American Executive since Abraham Lincoln. I may as well explain that I have called him the most effective because, with a strong hostile element among the Congressmen of his own party, he succeeded in securing the most valuable piece of legislation for the country which has been enacted since the War of Secession. This, however, is anticipating the time which is yet to be considered in this recital. As Governor, Mr. Cleveland protected the rights and the property of the taxpayers against wasteful and illegal legislation. He acted as trustee for those who, by the payment of taxes, furnished the revenues of the State. He showed also that courage, that absolute indifference to possible, even to probable, consequences to himself, which more than once distinguished his career as President. He was always unmoved from his purpose to consider

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as pre-eminent the rights of the whole State, notwithstanding popular or partisan clamor. So, against the outcries of the people of the city of New York, he declined to sign a bill granting a uniform fare of five cents on the Elevated Railway, not because such a fare would not have been sufficient and, therefore, just, but because, by its own law, the State was pledged in honor not to pass such a measure. "But we have especially in our keeping," he wrote, "the honor and good faith of a great State, and we should see to it that no suspicion attaches, through any act of ours, to the fair fame of the Commonwealth."

The calm sense and the cool courage which enabled Mr. Cleveland to defend the law against the assaults of passion did not impair his usefulness nor has his conduct injured his fame. He would not yield to the passions of the multitude, nor would he sign bills whose enactment would merely have aided his party.

These were the days when Civil Service Reform was in its infancy, for it was when Mr. Cleveland was Governor, in 1883, that the Pendleton Bill, establishing the present national merit system, was passed by Congress. Mr. Cleveland's appointments as Governor, however, were made on about the same principle as that which was adopted nearly twenty years later by Mr. Roosevelt. He entered office at a time when the spoils system was in vogue. There was no classified list whatever, and it had been the practice of good Executives to secure the best assistants whom the party workers could name. Mr. Cleveland only insisted upon good men, the best who could be obtained from the recognized source; but for some of his officers, notably for his Superintendent of Insurance, and for his Commissioner of the Capitol, he promoted subordinates, or went entirely outside of the politicians and sought for experts. He treated the subjects of labor and corporations from the point of view of a sane and sympathetic lawyer and man of affairs. He would promote the valid interests of both, and he would defend the State, or the community, from the injurious acts of either. He rose steadily in the esteem of all who desire to see government in the hands of careful men devoted to the general good, servants of the law, having those essential characteristics, apparently so commonplace, in fact so uncommon, that make a man a trustee who is to be trusted implicitly with all the property of his wards or with all the rights and privileges of his State or of his country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus confided in, not only by the people of his State, but by the observing and watchful people of the country, Mr. Cleveland came to his national honors. He had been elected Governor of the State before he completed his term as Mayor of Buffalo, and he was chosen President of the United States while he was still Governor. As he was nominated for Governor by the able politicians who led the Democrats of the State outside of Tammany Hall and Kings County, so it was by their astute leadership that the National Convention which met in Chicago on the 8th of July, 1884, was convinced that Mr. Cleveland was the most available, and the best, man to lead the Democratic party in the coming contest. His nomination was not a spontaneous act on the part of the Convention. He met with opposition, and the most dangerous hostility came from his own State. Tammany Hall, under the leadership of John Kelly, was strongly opposed to him in 1884, as the same organization was opposed to him later under the leadership of Richard Croker. In the whole course of his political career he never made friends with the element of his party which Tammany represented. Once in a while he yielded his judgment to some of the ordinary kind of party leaders, usually to his regret and never to their full satisfaction; but he never made it the rule of his conduct to take the word of the "organization," even when the leader was a Senator, in place of the word of better citizens who had no private ends to gain by securing the appointment to public office of men who would do their bidding. Tammany was against him because his election meant nothing of profit to the "Hall." Furthermore, too, there were as candidates for the nomination distinguished men who had rendered admirable service to the party and the country, any one of whom would have had the advantage, in character, over the Republican candidate. Thomas F. Bayard, Allen G. Thurman and Thomas A. Hendricks were the principal names against his, and the first of these, to say nothing of the others, appealed strongly to the independent voters. All three, however, were hampered in the estimation of the country, because they had participated, in opposition to the prevailing party and its triumphant policy, in the politics of the War and of reconstruction. They had thus been looked upon by thousands of people who had actually grown weary of the Republican party, and of its jangling leaders, as enemies of the Union. An infu-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion of new men was needed, and there was one new man who, in less than three years, had made a reputation as the best executive in the country. Mr. Cleveland received 392 votes on the first ballot; Mr. Bayard, 170; Mr. Thurman, 88. Under the two-thirds rule, 547 votes were needed for a nomination. After the first ballot there was an adjournment overnight, during which a "spontaneous" outburst for Mr. Hendricks was organized. The plan was carried out on the following morning. There were a magnificent tumult, vociferous shouting, dazzling waving of banners. The plotted effort to stampede the Convention was worthy of its authors; and, when it was over, Mr. Cleveland received 683 votes and Mr. Hendricks 45½. Then Mr. Hendricks was made the candidate for Vice-President.

The campaign which followed, so far as the politicians were concerned, was all that a Presidential campaign should not be; but the Independents supported Mr. Cleveland and the issue became one of character. Mr. Blaine was tainted as a public man; an effort was made to taint Mr. Cleveland's private character. This effort reacted on those who originated it and who hoped to profit by it. A committee of Republicans of Buffalo investigated the accusations against him and became strong admirers and partisans of Mr. Cleveland. Mr. Cleveland was elected, receiving 219 electoral votes to 182 cast for Mr. Blaine. Mr. Cleveland carried New York, New Jersey and Connecticut. The thirty-six votes of New York determined the election, and that State was carried by Mr. Cleveland by a plurality of only 1,047. An effort was made to reverse the decision, and the people of the city of New York, by reason of a suspicion which they entertained of an attempt by a telegraph company to tamper with the returns, grew dangerously angry. At last the truth was acknowledged; but Republican politicians, then disappointed, continued, and continue, to declare that Mr. Cleveland was "counted in" in New York. The charge was repeated last by Senator Hoar in his book of reminiscences. The Senator fixed upon Long Island City as the place where the fraud was perpetrated. This was a new location. It was charged originally against the city of New York. As a matter of fact, there was never a fairer count in the State of New York. Each party watched the other with closest care. The Republicans controlled the majority of the returning officers of the State, and the intention of these

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was suspected, as was the intention of the Democrats by the others. The Republicans, in their nervous anxiety, were finally misled by a mistake in the count of the city's votes. An early announcement of the Butler vote showed apparently that a very large number of ballots had been cast for the Greenback candidate. Further examination indicated that the mistake consisted in giving, as the Butler vote, the sum of all the ballots cast for all the electors, instead of the number of ballots cast for the leading elector. There was nothing in the charge; while Senator Hoar was possibly deceived by a new accusation invented long after the election, and never heard of by any other responsible person, or else his memory had betrayed him into reviving the old charge, which all but credulous partisans had recognized as exploded.

When Mr. Cleveland was elected President, a new and useful, and, therefore, a successful political era might have begun for the country. A strong second party might have been built up; a party decidedly different from its antagonist in mental attributes and in political tendency; a party which, while in power, would have the strong Republican party for its opponent, and which, out of power, would itself constitute that kind of an opposition without which there is little hope for good government. If there is no such party now as that which Mr. Cleveland seemed to lead in the early part of the year 1885, it is the fault of the heterogeneous mass that did its best to discredit the administration of the only Democratic President since the War, and that, in the end, wrecked the party itself.

Mr. Cleveland had many difficulties to overcome. Clamoring at his back were thousands of fellow partisans who had been excluded from all Federal office since 1861 because they were Democrats. Some of these were infants during the War of Secession, so that the partisan charge made against their elders that they had sympathized with the South could not hold against them. Not only were the Federal offices filled with Republicans, but these offices had been used for partisan purposes, and their incumbents had formed the nucleus of the party army which was devoted to Republican success. It was absolutely necessary that there should be many removals, and doubtless there were more than were necessary for the good of the public service. Mr. Cleveland's standard was stated in a letter to Mr. George Will-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

iam Curtis, President of the National Civil Service Reform Association. The letter was written before Mr. Cleveland was inaugurated. In it the President-elect, after saying that the new law would be enforced, as would all laws, announced his attitude toward Democratic applicants as follows: "If I were addressing none but party friends, I should deem it proper to remind them that though the coming administration is to be Democratic, a due regard to the people's interest does not permit faithful party work to be always rewarded by appointment to office, and to say to them that, while Democrats may expect all proper consideration, selections for office not embraced within the civil service rules will be based upon sufficient inquiry as to fitness instituted by those charged with that duty, rather than persistent importunity or self-solicited recommendations on behalf of candidates for appointment."

The struggle for the "relief of silver" from the penalties of the "crime of 1873" had begun. Both parties were engaged in the dubious task of reinstating the "white metal." The Democratic leaders of the silver forces in the House of Representatives were Mr. Bland and Mr. A. J. Warner. The latter wrote a letter to Mr. Cleveland asking for his views on the question. The Act of 1878, requiring the coinage of at least $2,000,000 of silver every month, was in force. In his reply, Mr. Cleveland did not court the silver Democrats. On the contrary, he told them firmly that he favored the "suspension of the purchase and coinage of silver." It was a strong letter, and, what is more important, it was the letter of a man who believed in indicating the independence of the Executive Department. Here was a President intent upon speaking his own views as the Constitution required that the President should do. These letters were written before the inauguration, so that Mr. Cleveland began his administration under suspicion of the Democratic spoilsmen and the Democratic silver men. At this period neither party desired a President who would refuse to reward party service with public place, while all so-called practical politicians who believed in the free coinage of silver were clamoring for it, while those who were opposed to it were keeping still. Mr. Cleveland offended against the traditions and the practice.

Mr. Cleveland became at once the President of the whole country, as he had been Mayor of the whole city of Buffalo and Gov-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ernor of the whole State of New York. This distinguished him from most modern Presidents, Mr. Hayes being a notable exception. The Democratic President further returned to the policy of older days in choosing his Cabinet. He had a very small acquaintance with public men, and, therefore, he invited the prominent Democrats of the country, especially those of the Senate and the House of Representatives, to consult with him at Albany, where he was passing the time between the election and his inauguration. The result of his consultations was a very strong Cabinet, although the appointment of Mr. Bayard, Mr. Garland and Mr. Lamar, who would have been very useful to the new administration if they had remained in the Senate, may be criticised. The two New York members of the Cabinet were Mr. Manning and Mr. Whitney, and they were strongly supplemented by Mr. Daniel S. Lamont, who was the President's Secretary. The Cabinet was the most distinguished of all Presidential cabinets since the administration of Mr. Lincoln, with the possible exception of that of Mr. Hayes. The return of the Democrats to power took place under promising auspices. Many of the great appointments, notably that of Edward J. Phelps as minister to England, were in keeping with the Cabinet appointments, while many of the subordinate places were also filled by strong and able men. The incoming of the party was of great value to the country, to which was thus given a new body of public servants intent upon bettering the work of their predecessors.

The new President, when he took office in 1885, was able to inaugurate a struggle for the independence of the Executive. Through its control of the civil service, constitutional and usurped, the Senate had been able to make the President subordinate in the matter of appointments. Mr. Cleveland was the only President since the War of Secession who insisted, against the opposition of the Senate, upon asserting and enjoying the rights and powers which the Constitution has given to the Executive Department. The Tenure of Office Act was passed in 1867 for the purpose of compelling Andrew Johnson to retain an obnoxious Secretary of War. In 1869, soon after General Grant's inauguration, the most obnoxious features of the law were repealed. In 1885 the Senate, the majority being Republican, and, on this occasion, under the leadership of Senator Edmunds, insisted on a report from the Attorney-General as to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasons for the removal of the United States District Attorney of Southern Alabama. The further contention was made that the Senate was entitled to know the reasons for which the President made removals, and to this Mr. Cleveland, assuming the responsibility of the Attorney General's refusal to comply with the Senate's demand, asserted that the duty of nomination and removal was placed by the Constitution upon him alone, and that he would permit no interference by a co-ordinate branch of the Government. The President, he argued, was alone responsible, and he would not tolerate any questioning of his motives. Mr. Cleveland gained a signal victory over the Senate. In 1886, the remainder of the Tenure of Office Act was repealed. Mr. Cleveland, like his predecessors and like his successors also, notwithstanding his victory on this occasion, was greatly hampered by the practice of the Senate, and especially by its "rule of courtesy." This rule was frequently resorted to in order to prevent Mr. Cleveland from refusing to name for offices the friends of Senators; in his second administration it was used for the purpose of preventing him from securing the appointment of the Democrats in whom he especially confided. Mr. Cleveland was more than once forced to appoint men of whom he did not approve, or whom he would not have selected, in order that he might carry on the Government by filling the essential subordinate places. He did not yield gracefully to this system of compulsion, but the Senators would have crippled the Government, by refusing their assent to any nominations, if the President had not yielded now and then, but by his obstinate assertion of his independence on every occasion and at every moment when he could succeed, Mr. Cleveland gained the enmity of the spoilsmen of both parties. He also incurred the antagonism of the Independents, or "Mugwumps" as they had been called in the campaign of 1884, because these would not consent to any dalliance with the old system of rewarding politicians. Before his official career was ended, however, the Independent leaders and voters came thoroughly to understand his real devotion to their own ideals, and perhaps to realize the difference between the limitations upon the President, who is forced to work the institutions of Government with the means at his command, and the freedom of those whose duty it is to keep the standard constantly before the public.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Cleveland's first administration enormously increased the credit of the Democratic party, and it greatly helped the Republican party. The Democrats controlled the House of Representatives, and the Republicans controlled the Senate. Some excellent measures were enacted, and the attacks upon the integrity of the Government and upon the prosperity of the country which had been predicted by reckless partisans were not made. The House advocated and passed good measures, and the Senate majority exercised its power, on the whole wisely, for the public good. The old rule of the succession to the Presidency was changed to be more in harmony with our system of government, so that the Presidency would go, if there were no Vice-President, to the members of the Cabinet in a certain order of precedence, instead of, first, to the President *pro tempore* of the Senate and then to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Inter-State Commerce Commission was established. A law was passed regulating the counting of the electoral votes, to the end that we might never again have a repetition of the utterly demoralizing performance after the election of 1876.

The great legislative feature of this first term was the attempt to change the tariff taxes. Mr. Cleveland came slowly to his final conviction as to the need of tariff reform, as to the injustices of the existing tariff to the consumers of the country—that is, to the country at large. His progress to the views which he expressed in his tariff message of 1887 was not satisfactory to the Democrats in Congress, who had then been engaged in the struggle for more rational duties since 1883; but, when Mr. Cleveland finally spoke, it was with a power which shook the political body. His message was confined to the single theme. "It is a condition which confronts us, not a theory," he said, and he added: "The simple and plain duty which we owe the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government, and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury through the perversion of governmental powers. These things can and should be done with safety to all our industries, without danger to the opportunity for remunerative labor which our working-men have, and with benefit to them and all our people, by cheapening their means of subsistence and increasing the measure of their comforts."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The message was followed during the session by a bill by Mr. Roger Q. Mills—really the bill of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, of which Mr. Mills was chairman. In 1883, when Mr. Morrison introduced his bill, Mr. Randall, chief of the knot of Democratic Protectionists, was able to procure the defeat of the measure. The party had grown more united in 1888, and Mr. Mills's bill was carried in the House by a vote of 162 to 149.

The President had not kept his hold upon the country for reasons which have been given, and which were partly the consequences of offences to Democratic politicians, chief of whom was Senator Gorman. Mr. Cleveland lost the election of 1888, and the demoralization which was eventually to deprive the country of an opposition party that had given so much of promise may be said to have set in. It is not true that Mr. Cleveland was defeated solely on account of his tariff message, a claim which is flattering to the desires and interests of the Protectionists. He was defeated partly by the vote of Independents who gladly returned to him in 1892, and by the unostentatious disaffection of certain Democratic spoilsmen who would naturally be opposed to any President who would not distribute offices to needy henchmen.

The four years' interval between 1889 and 1893 were spent by Mr. Cleveland in New York City in the practice of his profession. In that interval Mr. Cleveland grew wonderfully in reputation with the people of the country. The Democratic rule had been dreaded by a good many people who are afflicted with the too common notion that all political opponents are wicked enemies of their country; but, under Mr. Cleveland's leadership, the party had done well for the country, and, what is of more importance, notwithstanding the display by some of its leaders of predatory instincts with respect to spoils — instincts which have not been wholly unknown among Republican politicians— the party had shown that the subject of its thoughts when it was placed in practical charge of the Government was for the country, and not for special selected interests in whose behalf the taxing power of the Government was employed. The Republicans had carried the House of Representatives and had retained the Senate. Mr. Thomas B. Reed was chosen Speaker. His administration was particularly signalized by the adoption of new

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rules for the House of Representatives that eventually put an end to debate and deliberation in the popular branch of Congress. The principal results of the Republican control of the Government were disastrous to the country. Thus again had the Democratic party received benefit which would have been long enduring if the leaders in Congress had realized their great good fortune in possessing such leaders as Mr. Cleveland and his immediate party friends, and such a cause as that which he made the controlling issue in his message of 1887. This issue was already beginning to enable the Democrats to carry Congressional districts, which theretofore had been always Republican, in the States of Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Nebraska and Iowa. The two acts of the Republican party which wrought disaster were the McKinley Tariff Act of 1890 and the so-called Sherman Silver Act of the same year. The McKinley Tariff Act was based frankly on the assertion that the national Government should use its power to levy customs dues primarily for protection and incidentally for revenue. This, of course, was an act for the benefit of a favored class. The Silver Act directed the monthly purchase of 4,500,000 ounces of silver. The Senate had amended this act when it came from the House of Representatives with a free-coinage measure, but this amendment was thrown out by the House. Its bill, as adopted by the Conference Committee, largely the work of Mr. Sherman, was enacted. Senator Sherman had discredited Mr. Harrison by asserting that the purchasing measure was necessary because, if that much were not given to the silver people, including in this term the silver-mine owners, a free-coinage measure might be passed, and Mr. Harrison would sign such a bill. Another unpopular measure was Mr. Lodge's Force Bill. This was killed eventually in the Senate by the silver men, who made a bargain with Democratic Senators to this end.

The result of the conduct of the Republicans resulted in a sweeping Democratic victory in 1890. The Senate of the Fifty-second Congress, which began on March 4th, 1891, remained Republican; but the House became largely Democratic. There were in it 236 Democrats, 88 Republicans and 8 Independents. In this campaign the tariff was the main issue, and it is to this and to the issue created by the Force Bill, and to the contrast between Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Harrison, that the Democrats owed their great victory.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Democrats nominated Mr. Cleveland for the third time in 1892, promising the repeal of the McKinley Tariff Act, and denouncing the Sherman Silver Act as a "cowardly makeshift." The platform further declared that "the dollar unit of coinage of both metals must be of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value." This was Mr. Cleveland's platform. He had refused to consent to be nominated until he had learned of the terms of the money plank. The silver question had come to the front by the enactment of the Sherman law and by the Senate's passage of a free-coinage bill. In view of Mr. Cleveland's attitude on the money question, evidenced in his Warner letter of 1885, the silver men were opposed to him. At that time these were divided between the two parties; but, as the South had adopted the cause of free coinage, the larger number of silver advocates in Congress were Democrats. The Republicans and Democrats of the West were for silver, and the two parties in the East were opposed to free coinage. There were other than silver Democrats opposed to Mr. Cleveland's third nomination. Mr. Gorman was against it, and so was Mr. David B. Hill, of New York. The latter called a party State convention, known as the "Snap Convention," early in the year, and it appointed a delegation favorable to his own candidacy. Thus it seemed that Mr. Cleveland's nomination was opposed by the Democrats of his own State. This was further emphasized by the action of Tammany Hall, and other dissatisfied Democrats, who, at the very Convention, declared in writing over their own signatures that Mr. Cleveland could not carry his own State at the election, if he were nominated. Contrary evidence was furnished by the "Anti-Snappers," who held a convention at Syracuse. They were led by Charles S. Fairchild, William R. Grace, Oswald Ottendorfer and a company of young men who had entered politics at the dawn of what promised to be a new era, and who were intent upon serving the country rather than their own interests. The Convention, answering the demand of the country, disregarded the opposition of Mr. Hill and Tammany Hall, and nominated Mr. Cleveland. The result of the election justified the nomination. Mr. Cleveland received 5,556,562 votes and Mr. Harrison, 5,162,874. The electoral vote was as follows: Cleveland, 277; Harrison, 145; Weaver, 22. Weaver's popular vote seemed to be significant. It was 1,055,424, but it was, in fact, the result of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a fusion in Republican States by means of which the candidates of the People's party received the support of the Democrats. Congress now became Democratic in both Houses. In the Senate there were 44 Democrats, 37 Republicans, 4 Independents and 3 vacancies. In the House there were 218 Democrats, 127 Republicans and 11 Populists.

When Mr. Cleveland was inaugurated, the Sherman silver law had furnished the needed impulse to push the country to the verge of the great panic which soon began. By custom, which had the force of law, the Treasury was keeping a gold reserve of $100,000,000. This reserve had been encroached upon in the Harrison administration, although the facts were not openly confessed. The first complete fiscal year during which the McKinley Tariff Bill was in operation, the customs receipts of the Government fell off from $220,000,000, the receipts of 1891, to $177,000,000, about $43,000,000. There was an increase to $203,000,000 in 1893, but a falling off in 1894 to $132,000,000, nearly $90,000,000 less than the receipts from customs duties for the fiscal year 1891.

Appropriations had increased, while revenue was decreasing. The last year for which a Democratic Congress made appropriations was the fiscal year 1892. The expenditures for that year, excluding post-office expenditures, amounted to $345,000,000: the first year of the return of the Republican party to Congress was 1891; the first year for which the Republican Congress appropriated was 1893. The expenditures for that year were $383,000,000. While the public finances were disarranged, the main reason for the disturbance was monetary. The fear that the country was in danger of going to a silver basis was world-wide. Gold was hoarded. The legal-tender notes were used for the purpose of extracting gold from the Treasury. Therefore gold left the Treasury. In the opinion of Mr. Harrison and his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Foster, the time had come when it was necessary to issue bonds for the purpose of obtaining the gold needed by the Government. The plates were made ready in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, but the 4th of March arrived before they had been used, and Mr. Harrison's administration escaped its own responsibility, and the responsibility of its party, which was most unjustly thrown upon Mr. Cleveland and his administration. His antagonists have not ceased to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

blame him and the so-called Wilson Tariff Bill for the panic of 1893, notwithstanding the fact that it was primarily due to legislation for which both parties were responsible, although Republicans were its authors and main advocates, and notwithstanding the further fact that the so-called Wilson Bill did not go into effect for two years after the panic began. Then, too, for the fiscal year 1895, the first year during which the new law operated, the customs revenue increased by $21,000,000; in the second year of the law it increased $8,000,000 more; in the last year, $16,000,000 more was added to the revenues. This increase of revenue, however, is not to be credited to what the Republicans denominate a "free-trade" measure, for the bill, as changed in the Senate, was not the measure advocated by Mr. Wilson, approved by Mr. Cleveland, and passed by the House of Representatives.

I have anticipated the course of events for the purpose of completing, in its appropriate place, all that I shall say with reference to the untruthful assertions concerning the responsibility of Mr. Cleveland, and of the legislation of his administration, for the hard times then brought upon the country by the silver law of reckless and incompetent public men. It now became Mr. Cleveland's duty to repeal this legislation, to put an end to the menace which had created a currency famine, had nearly suspended business and had ruined thousands of men. Mr. Cleveland, in this work, had the able support of a strong Cabinet, but leaned especially on his Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Carlisle. The other members of the Cabinet who were of special assistance were Mr. Gresham, Secretary of State, and Mr. Lamont, Secretary of War. The President bent all his energies to relieving the country. He considered nothing but the public good. He was advised by friends in whom he trusted to recognize at once the necessity of issuing bonds. He declined to follow the advice, hoping that the need might be escaped. If he had been thinking merely of his personal and the party's welfare, he would have followed the advice, for, in that event, mendacious slanderers would not have been able to speak as if his subsequent issues of bonds were necessitated by occasions which he and not themselves had furnished. The distress of the country became so great that he called the Congress in special session on August 7th for the declared purpose of repealing the pur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

chasing clause of the Sherman act. For three months Washington was the scene of a great struggle, the centre of an interest which was due to the anxiety of the whole commercial and business world. Never had there been a firmer President, and never so obstinate a Secretary of the Treasury. These two were one in the stern resolve that there should be unconditional repeal.

In the House, under the lead of Mr. William L. Wilson, the repeal bill passed on the 28th of August. It was when it went to the Senate that the difficulty was encountered. The silver Senators rallied against it. From the very first it was clear that the bill would pass as it came from the House if a vote should be taken. The silver men, therefore, filibustered against a vote. They were both Republicans and Democrats. The Republicans made the dilatory motions, the Democratic silver Senators voting for them. The administration was hampered in the Senate by unfortunate and inescapable conditions. Senator Voorhees was chairman of the Finance Committee. He had agreed to support the repeal bill, and, as chairman, was consequently the leader, but he was half-hearted and not well informed. Some other Democrats were not loyal either to the President or to the cause in which they really and professedly believed. One of them, openly acting with the administration, in secret constantly encouraged the silver Senators to look for a compromise in favor of silver,—a compromise, to use the phrase of the day, which would "do something for silver." Every possible effort was made to break the administration lines. Correspondents for newspapers which were strong for absolute repeal were, more than once, told confidentially by so-called gold Democrats that the administration had agreed to a compromise. These men were contending for "party harmony." Finally, by a miserable trick, all gold Democrats but one were convinced that the President had assented to a compromise, and some of Mr. Carlisle's handwriting was fraudulently used for the purpose of deception. The one Democrat who suspected the ruse was Senator Vilas. Mr. Voorhees had promised to introduce the pretended compromise on the following Monday. On hearing of this conspiracy, Mr. Carlisle and Mr. Gresham set themselves to compass its defeat. They worked with Mr. Voorhees until he was brought to see the false pretence on which his promise had been obtained. On the Monday morning, Mr. Cleveland sent his carriage to the railroad

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

station for Senator McPherson, who had been at home in New Jersey, and brought him to the White House. He was thus obtained as an ally with Senator Vilas. A little later, the gold Democrats who had signed the compromise went to the White House to persuade the President that his assent was essential to the harmony of the party, and there learned from Mr. Cleveland, with an emphasis that shocked some of them, that he would not consent. They had heard of the administration's efforts to overcome the conspirators. When they went to the Capitol they found that Senator Teller and Senator Dubois, the Republican silver leaders, had also heard of the proceedings, and were deeply angered that the Democrats had come together to make a party measure and thus to heal a party breach. They denounced the silver Democrats and declared that they would filibuster no longer. The struggle was over, and, with a slight amendment, which was quickly agreed to by the House of Representatives, the Senate passed the unconditional repeal bill on the 30th of October.

Mr. Cleveland is said to have broken up his party by his persistence for unconditional repeal. This is said by critics some of whom confess that unconditional repeal was essential to the country. Therefore, in saying that Mr. Cleveland made a mistake in thus opposing a party harmony dependent upon the continuance of an evil which was injurious to the whole country, they say, in effect, that there are times when the country's welfare must be postponed to the party's exigencies. Mr. Cleveland did not agree with them. In securing the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman act he rendered the country, and the whole commercial world, a service the like of which has not been rendered by any President since Lincoln gave his life to the cause of the Union.

The silver agitation was not ended by the repeal of this act, but it needed the impulse which it received from the defeat of the Democratic tariff policy to make it as dangerous to the country as it afterwards became. The leading feature of the Democratic platform of 1892 was the promise to repeal the McKinley bill, and to make a new tariff law by which the interests of the people would be considered. "Unless," said Mr. Wilson, prophetically as it turned out, in introducing the bill of 1894, "the Democracy takes up this great cause of tariff reform, to win or

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lose with it, live or die for it, the Democratic party ought to go out of power, as it will." It is unnecessary to recapitulate the misfortunes of the Wilson Bill. The measure, as all tariff measures not drawn by their beneficiaries must be made, was drawn with the assistance of the Secretary of the Treasury. It was a fairly good measure, as good as could be passed. It was passed by the House of Representatives on the 1st of February, 1894. When the bill reached the Senate it was transformed into a high protection measure by Senators Gorman, Hill, Murphy, Smith and others acting with the Republicans led by Senator Aldrich. The Senate added more than six hundred amendments. Mr. Cleveland refused to sign the bill, and perhaps he made the great mistake of his public life in not vetoing it. In a letter to Mr. Wilson, which the latter read on the floor of the House, Mr. Cleveland denounced the bill as it then stood as an act of perfidy and party dishonor. The result of this was a still further breach between Mr. Cleveland and some of the leaders of his party. What is of more importance, however, is the fact that the party had lost its opportunity and had become utterly demoralized. Its Western and Southern leaders ceased to favor free coinage for mere party reasons, as Mr. McKinley and other Republican leaders had done, and became enamoured of the policy as a party issue. The protection Democrats in the Senate had once again demonstrated that the tariff beneficiaries were strong enough to prevent the party from keeping its tariff promises. All that Mr. Cleveland had stood for and all that the Democratic party had seemed to stand for in 1885, when it was gaining the confidence of the country and becoming a real party of opposition, was discarded. The party had ceased to be safe and sane; it had become a threat to prosperity and to monetary soundness, while it had broken its promise of tariff reform to the Western people, who had gone to it in 1892 and had made its victory overwhelming. These were ready now to take up any cause which would injure the East, for the East was the especial home of protection, and they were Eastern Democrats who had denied Mr. Cleveland's faith and the party promise. The party was ready to fulfil Mr. Wilson's prediction and "go out of power."

During this term the President was compelled, on several occasions, to issue bonds for the purpose of maintaining the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Treasury's gold reserve. The distress of the Treasury did not abate after the 4th of March, 1893. On the contrary, the Government was often very hard pressed for funds needed to meet its obligations, and had it not been for the skill and energy of a committee of the Treasury, selected by Mr. Carlisle, more than once the Government would have been forced, at one Sub-Treasury or another, to repudiate its checks. Finally, in January, 1894, the supply of gold at the Treasury was so low that Mr. Carlisle was obliged to sell bonds for $50,000,000. In the following November the sale of another $50,000,000 of bonds became necessary. As soon as the gold was in the Treasury, however, it began to disappear, and at the beginning of 1895 the reserve was down to about $50,000,000. Mr. Cleveland sent a special message to Congress in which he clearly pointed out the weaknesses of our money system, and urged the enactment of a law authorizing the issue of three-per-cent. bonds payable in gold. A bill to carry out this recommendation was defeated. Congress showed no disposition to take any steps for the protection of the gold reserve. By February 8th, 1895, the reserve had fallen to $42,000,000. The suspension of gold payments was imminent. The Sub-Treasurer in New York had notified the Treasury that his supply could hold out only one more day. Under these circumstances, Mr. Cleveland was compelled to secure gold where he could get it. He was criticised for not selling bonds by popular subscription, but there was no time to resort to that method. Subsequently bonds were thus sold. As it was, a contract was made with a syndicate of bankers, who agreed to furnish the Government with 3,500,000 ounces of gold (about $65,000,000), and to protect it, for four-per-cent. coin bonds at 104½. The bonds were issued under an old law. The President urged Congress to authorize the payment of the bonds in gold, informing it that, if that were done, the interest would be reduced to three per cent., and, in the thirty years during which the bonds were to run, the total saving of interest would be $16,000,000. Congress refused to grant Mr. Cleveland's request. It is well known to members on the floor that this result was brought about by a leading Republican to whom members of his own party applied for advice. He told them that they were under no obligation to help the Democratic administration out of its trouble—in other words, that they were not in duty bound to help a Demo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cratic President render a service to the country. Subsequently, this Republican voted in favor of the Ways and Means Committee's resolution to make the bonds payable in gold, but only after the roll was called and it was known that the proposition was defeated.

Two important episodes happened in this term which have been the theme of much discussion. One of them, the intervention of Mr. Cleveland in the Chicago strike of 1894, has been the cause of a good deal of comment, and the incident has been frequently alluded to as an act of tyranny directed against organized labor. Mr. Olney, then Attorney-General, and Mr. Cleveland were the objects of the criticism and attack. As a matter of fact, no one was more solicitous for the rights of the laboring man than Mr. Cleveland, and no one more firmly believed in the right of labor to organize than Mr. Olney, as was shown by his subsequent intervention to prevent the discharge of members of an organization of railroad employees by the receiver of the Reading Railroad. The strikers in Chicago were, it is true, guilty of committing "domestic violence," and if that were all Governor Altgeld was right in insisting that their suppression was the task of the State, with which the Federal Government should not interfere except on the invitation of the State authorities. But Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Olney took the ground that the power of the Federal Government was attacked by the rioters; that they were interfering with interstate commerce and with the carrying of the mails. They were subsequently sustained by the Supreme Court in the Debs case. Mr. Cleveland vindicated the law and the nation's authority. Injunctions were obtained, under the direction of Mr. Olney, for the purpose of preventing interference with and injury to the property of the United States, and the property of others the protection of which, under the laws of the nation, was the duty of the general Government. The injunction was defied. The United States Marshal reported that the mob only jeered at him when he read it. The riotous interference with property, the derailing of cars to obstruct the mail trains and the through business of the roads, continued. The troops under General Miles were ordered out, Mr. Cleveland issuing a proclamation in which he described all persons "forcibly resisting and obstructing the execution of the laws of the United States, or interfering with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the functions of the Government, or destroying or attempting to destroy the property belonging to the United States or under its protection," as "public enemies." Criminal proceedings were also begun in the courts. Debs and some others were arrested on the 10th of July, charged with obstructing the mails. On the 17th, Debs and the other officials of the Railway Union were again arrested charged with violation of the injunction. The Supreme Court, Justice Brewer delivering the opinion, decided that the President was within his Constitutional power in directly interfering to prevent forcible obstruction of the mails; and that the court had jurisdiction to issue the injunction. The episode was a notable exhibition of courage on the part of the elected President to uphold and to enforce the laws which he had sworn to execute. Here once more he displayed an absolute patriotism, for the temper of the time warned him and Mr. Olney plainly that they were risking their political futures by interfering with a mob of which the Democratic Governor of Illinois and the Democratic Mayor of Chicago were afraid. Ten years afterwards, when Mr. Cleveland's name was mentioned in all parts of the country as the possible candidate for President, he uttered and published an account of this strike, defending his own part in it with a courage and an indifference to the possible political consequences to himself the equal of which have been the happy possession of no other English-speaking politician of our day, with the exception of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Morley. In concluding his account of the affair, Mr. Cleveland wrote: "As we gratefully turn its concluding page, those who were most nearly related by executive responsibility to the troublous days whose story is told may well especially congratulate themselves on the part which fell to them in marking out the way and clearing the path, now unchangeably established, which shall hereafter guide our nation safely and surely in the exercise of the important functions which represent the people's trust."

The second episode was that of the contest between Venezuela and Great Britain on the subject of the boundary line between the two. It had been in progress since 1814, and the United States had taken part in it in order to secure the arbitration of the dispute. Many Secretaries of State and Ministers to England had participated; Mr. Fish, Mr. Evarts, Mr. Blaine, Mr. Frelinghuysen, Mr. Bayard, Mr. Gresham, and, at last, Mr.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Olney. Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Olney brought the subject to a conclusion. The Monroe Doctrine was both asserted and strictly limited. The contention was made that this country had the right to assert the doctrine for its own protection, and that it meant that no European country should establish or extend political dominion on this hemisphere, directly or indirectly. The question confronting the United States was whether England was or was not insisting on acquiring territory by unsubstantial claims, depending upon her power and upon the weakness of Venezuela. Mr. Cleveland and Mr. Olney insisted on arbitration, and the President, under the authority of Congress, appointed a commission in order to ascertain the character and the rightfulness of England's demands. In his message to Congress, Mr. Cleveland alluded to the possibility of a breach between this country and Great Britain, and this caused great disturbance in the money market; but the country was with the President, and England yielded quickly to his demands. It was always asserted by Mr. Cleveland and his friends that he had prevented a war between the two countries and had not created the danger of one. At any rate, England became more friendly to this country than its governing classes had ever been before. This occurred in 1895, and immediately afterwards, under the auspices of Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Olney and Lord Pauncefote negotiated a general arbitration treaty for the settlement of all disputes between the two countries. In 1897, this treaty was so mutilated by the amendments of a hostile Senate that it was practically defeated.

Mr. Cleveland went out of the Presidency in March, 1897, and, therefore, out of public life. His work as a statesman, however, was not done, for, on more than one occasion, he became the adviser of his countrymen, with whom his fame grew larger as time went on, until he was long recognized as our first citizen. His party had broken to pieces. If this were chargeable to him, it is because he did his duty to the country instead of seeking to win the support of party leaders selfishly seeking other than the country's good. But it is clear in the light of subsequent events that, if the party had possessed the wisdom and the virtue to follow Mr. Cleveland, the country would now enjoy the benefit of a strong and patriotic second party without which good government in a republic is difficult, if not impossible.

HENRY LOOMIS NELSON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INTERNATIONAL ARBITRATION FROM A SOCIALISTIC POINT OF VIEW.

BY JEAN JAURÈS, LEADER OF THE SOCIALISTS IN THE FRENCH CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES.

It will soon be a year since the Hague Conference closed its doors; and, though it must be confessed that the results are not very definite or important, even the most critical observer will have to admit that a most interesting problem was taken up and considered—viz., compulsory arbitration. The aim in view was that certain categories of conflicts and disputes should be handed over, as a matter of course, to the arbitration of the nations which took part in the Conference. It was not to be held necessary that the two Powers in contention would have to draw up a special treaty in order to bring about arbitration, nor would any other nation be expected to take the initiative in an effort to bring about arbitration. Arbitration would be required by the will of all of the nations represented at the Conference. A nation would have to arbitrate, whether or no.

Two very important consequences would spring from this decision. In the first place, this kind of arbitration would be the result of humanity's making its judicial appearance in the world, creating and promulgating laws applicable to all nations, not on account of any special arrangement of any sort between these nations, but simply by the fact that, forming a part of the Hague Conference, they had taken their place in organized Humanity.

Again, this new international law would make arbitration more honest and efficacious. When two nations are bound by special treaties or arbitration, there is ground for the suspicion that they are taking this position in order to present a stronger front to other nations. This "arbitration by couples" may be another form of defiance and strife. But when all civilized nations are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

united by a general treaty of arbitration, a death blow is delivered to any idea of that kind. Then arbitration contains no shadows or dark corners. It is all done in the full light of day and a feeling of truth and peace is spread abroad through the peoples.

In the second place, this more elevated sort of arbitration will lead the way to the extension of the benign principle to more serious disputes and even to some which without it might lead to the most disastrous conflicts. Up to the present time, states have declined to submit to arbitration anything affecting their existence or their honor, which reservations, of course, greatly restrict the field of arbitration. So long as arbitration is regulated by treaties between nations acting two by two, it will be very difficult to brush aside these unfortunate reservations. Old struggles have left behind them deep-seated feelings of revenge and many unhealed wounds. A great nation like France, for instance, having been forced to see her territory ruthlessly dismembered, would doubtless hesitate to propose to Germany alone a general arbitration treaty which would embrace all possible future differences. By so doing, France would feel that she was admitting the justice of this robbery. But France could accept without hesitation a general arbitration scheme which would embrace all nations, Germany included, and all differences, including this spoliation of Alsace-Lorraine. In this way, France could, without weakening her moral position, give her adhesion to the formula of universal and total arbitration. By so doing, she would not sacrifice to another state a portion of her national rights, she would not bow to brute force and the power of conquest, but she would consent—in the interest of humanity and the new order of ideas, so superior to the old order—no longer to have recourse to arms for the settling of differences between peoples.

When this great question of obligatory arbitration was brought up at the Hague Conference, it was discussed academically, but no conclusion was reached. It was found impossible to obtain the unanimous support of the delegations to this grand idea. The majority, however, made a plea in its favor, but this plea, unfortunately, is not binding. An understanding could not be reached concerning the definition of the differences which would be classed under the head of "subjects for obligatory arbitration." Different nations took different views, though it was not exactly a case of *quot homines, tot sententiæ*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Does this mean that the last Hague Conference was held in vain? Certainly not. So the head of the French mission, Senator Léon Bourgeois, was right when he took an optimistic view at a meeting of the friends of peace held in the Senate House a few months ago, and declared that the era of arbitration and concord was dawning. "It is an immense step in advance to secure this official support for the peace idea, which has been slowly developing in a hard soil. The victory is sure to come, if we do not lose courage in the struggle so well begun." Such were the excellent words of M. Bourgeois.

It would not appear, however, that the nations have labored much on these lines since the adjournment of the Conference last autumn. Has any advance been made concerning the category of differences which might eventually come under the head of obligatory arbitration? What about the regulations relative to the conduct of the international prize courts? What has diplomacy done, among the nations favoring arbitration, to advance this idea and to remove the objections thereto among the Governments which look askance at this reform? Are we planting seed that will produce a rich harvest when the next Hague Conference comes round? Yet a spirit of peace reigns among the peoples. This is certain. Thus, the present trouble over the Morocco business has not endangered the relations between Germany, on the one side, and France and England, on the other, as was the case in 1905. Those who, for a moment, alarmed all Europe with predictions about what they called "a war imminent between Japan and the United States," have been flatly contradicted by the Governments of those two peoples. The turmoil in the Balkans will probably be quieted without setting Europe by the ears.

Probably the most important outcome of the last Conference was the provision for its reassembling at regular intervals. This in itself will be a great preventive of war. Though some nations may be slow in accepting complete arbitration, these regularly recurring conferences will tend to keep the idea before them; and it will be harder and harder for Governments which have been meeting together in a friendly way to plunge suddenly into war. The contrast will eventually be regarded as so saddening, so inconsistent, such a veritable scandal, that rulers, peoples and Governments will hesitate before thus braving the condemnation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the universal conscience. But, however great may be the good that has come in one way and another from the Hague meetings, this good will continue to be very limited and will fall far short of what it might become, unless a strong effort is made to go on enlightening men's minds on this great subject of international arbitration. The old and new friends of peace must not sit down, calmly fold their arms and wait for the coming of the millennium!

International Socialism is resolved to devote itself to this good work. At our recent Socialist Congress, which was sitting at Stuttgart at the same moment as the Peace Conference at The Hague, we passed a resolution which declared that it was the duty of the working classes of all countries to labor without a halt in favor of the cause of international arbitration, "which, so far, has been so lukewarmly supported by existing Governments." This Stuttgart gathering gave rise in the European press to such a violent and confused discussion; the different political parties of the upper classes so vied with one another in misstating our declarations (this was especially the case in France and Germany), particularly denouncing us as "enemies of all idea of country," that what we said concerning obligatory arbitration was passed over in silence. And yet our action was of considerable importance and a new departure in our International Socialistic world, though Socialism, *per se,* has always stood for peace and against strife between brother nations. For did not Saint Simon, the famous founder of Saint Simonianism, propose, in the early part of the last century, the establishment of "a European parliament which should decide disputes between nations"? And Saint Simon was one of the early stars of Socialism. The International Socialist Congresses held prior to the Franco-German war of 1870 pronounced strongly against armed strife. This was especially the case with the Congress which met at Brussels. In fact, at these gatherings the anti-war resolutions were much stronger than those passed recently at Stuttgart. And yet our enemies in the anti-Socialist press have been holding up their hands in holy horror at "the extravagance of our demands on this head" made at this last Congress. The truth is that, until recent years, Socialists did not believe that international arbitration was possible in the existing state of society. It seemed hopeless to expect any good thing to come

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out of Nazareth. But since the Socialists have discovered the remarkable growth of their strength and the great influence which their doctrines can now exert on the affairs of the world, they perceive that there is a possibility of establishing a legal control over international disputes, even in the chaotic state of the present social system.

The external policy of modern Socialism is an evolution from its domestic policy. As Socialism has grown stronger at home, it has grown stronger in its foreign or international developments and policies. At the start, modern Socialism felt that its only aim should be the destruction of the existing régime; otherwise it could accomplish nothing; existing abuses were sure to paralyze every trial and effort of the Socialistic idea. The old formula was: Destroy first, and build up afterwards. Thus, for a long time, at least in Europe, Socialism looked askance at universal suffrage, which could add only political servitude to the existing economical servitude of the masses. The same thing is true of parliamentary action. During many years, Socialism had no faith in what legislatures were inclined to do for the amelioration of the working classes. They laughed at the so-called "reforms," which brought but a trivial relief to the suffering people, and tended simply to calm the spirit of revolt, which demanded complete regeneration. This disdain was bestowed even on trade unions and co-operative organizations of all kinds, which were considered a means of weakening the unity of action of the working-man, destroying his individuality and making him "a dumb part of a mercantile combination." Perhaps this period of "a rough and unyielding exclusiveness" was necessary for the upbuilding of a vigorous and healthy ideal, just as fresh buds are often protected by a hard external covering, which preserves them for a while from the cold of a late spring and the attack of harmful insects. But this state of things could not last.

Socialism eventually perceived that, as it grew in strength, it could no longer separate itself from the real world, from the living life of men, so that the forces which it at first disdained to make use of, it finally decided to utilize and shape to its own purposes. Consequently, we find to-day Socialism bringing universal suffrage to its aid, taking part in legislative debates and actively associated in all the trade unions and co-operative under-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

takings. This new departure gave fresh force and success to Socialism the world over. The upper classes now see that it "has come to stay."

The international problem being the most complicated one to solve, was taken up last by modern Socialism. War, peace, arbitration became forthwith topics of first-class importance in the eyes of thoughtful Socialists. Then it was that the attack on Capitalism was waged more earnestly than ever, for we felt that it was a cause of disorder, so fierce, so hard to cope with, that the only way of abolishing or of limiting the evil effects of war was to destroy Capitalism itself. We perceived clearly that peace would spring from the social revolution and from the social revolution alone. What is the use, we asked, of sowing the good seeds of arbitration in a field where grow the poisonous weeds of competition and all the hates associated therewith? Let us first uproot the privilege of property from which war is sure to spring. Let us rid all the fields of this deadly herb, and then peace will bloom of itself like a cornflower in the midst of the wheat. Hence it was that the leaders of Socialism were at first divided as to how this cause of peace and arbitration should be treated. We wished to help the good cause, but we did not want to be duped and to run after will-o'-the-wisps.

As the political influence of Socialism began to grow in France, and as we saw more clearly how useful to the cause, in every country, was the development of the peace idea, then we became convinced of the vast importance of international arbitration. We said to ourselves that we must henceforth, therefore, propagate this idea, strengthen it in every way possible, permit it to act in every reasonable way and extend its beneficent influence to every sort of conflict. This should be one of the immediate aims of all our international action. In fact, this is the very idea that the Stuttgart Congress promulgated, and the advancement of this idea is to be for the future one of the characteristic features of the international policy of modern Socialism.

It becomes interesting, therefore, to consider how Socialism can help to bring about the triumph of arbitration. We know that this is to be an immensely difficult task. We are not so simple-minded as to imagine that good words and Congress resolutions are going to put an end to the evils of passion and greed. Though the ever-growing strength of Socialism gives us con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fidence, we know that we have a hard fight before us with the powers of war and hate. But we perceive that the world of Capitalism is divided against itself. If this division, this anarchy, is a constant cause of conflict, it also lends itself to the promotion of the interests of peace. It rarely happens that all interests, industrial, commercial and financial, are agreed at a given moment in all nations, or even in one nation, in the matter of either war or peace. Though capital throughout the world is of one mind in the fight against the working classes and in the determination to prolong the privileges of the well-to-do classes, these last are often at loggerheads over the exploitation of these privileges. Thus, a certain group, at a certain moment, finds it advantageous to precipitate a war, which will bring them fresh business, open new markets and create other monopolies; whereas other groups, influenced by bond-holdings or other interests, are opposed to such a conflict, seeing in it a check to their business transactions, a financial panic and the weakening of the money-market. So, the more international financial and industrial affairs become, the stock-exchange of one country being interested in the bonds, etc., of many of the other countries, the more complex this universal confusion becomes, and we find in this circle of financiers, some favoring war, while another group is as earnestly supporting pacific measures. Hence it is that International Socialism, with a concentrated, homogeneous and uniform action entirely directed towards peace, in opposition to the incoherent and contradictory course of Capitalism, will exert a much more powerful influence than is indicated by the very different struggle going on between Socialism and Capitalism.

The Hague is, as I have already said, a most useful auxiliary and a strong foundation on which to build work for peace. The Governments themselves, both monarchies and Capitalist republics, stand sponsors to the good cause. Whether they be acting from a generous and humane desire to lessen the chances of war, or because they are frightened by the terrible tension which great standing armies cause in all the budgets, or because they have little or no money for the amelioration of the condition of the working classes, which some think would check the rising wave of Socialism, or because they are anxious over the unknown complications which may spring from an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

armed conflict under the present military conditions,—in a word, whatever may be the reason, it cannot be denied that these Governments have proclaimed of their own accord, as the world has witnessed at two Hague Conferences, that it is necessary to substitute, in so far as possible, law for armed force in settling international differences. Yet, at the same time, they are frightened at the radical innovation which they have proposed, and are timidly trying to escape from its complete application, though the grand fact remains that this appeal for concord comes from the ruling classes of a system where the conflict of selfish interests is a solid and permanent law. International Socialism, while perseveringly advocating this reform and pressing it unceasingly on the attention of the powers-that-be and on the long-suffering people, has not been forced to create the machinery for effecting the realization of this great panacea, for, in the midst of the sea of troubles that is modern society, "the happy island" is clearly seen rising on the not-distant horizon.

It is now the custom for all our national and international Socialist Congresses to remind the nations of the necessity of arbitration. Whenever treaties for the regulation of international questions come up for discussion in parliaments, it is now habitual for the Socialists in the bodies where they are members to urge that an arbitration clause be inserted, and that this clause be far more comprehensive than the cases covered by the Governments' projects, generally.

But all these efforts would be vain and we would accomplish but useless things, if we limited our arbitration ideas to some preconceived system. What good would be attained if nations that had agreed to submit to arbitration all their disputes—even the most vital ones—had not also agreed to accept certain rules and principles of law laid down by all the nations? He who honestly accepts the idea of arbitration also accepts its application to special cases recognized by all arbitrators and by the parties to the dispute. Unless this common conscience exists and some sort of arbitration code be drawn up on these lines, there is very little in the reform; most of the disputes to be arbitrated would be settled really before being submitted to the arbitrators.

The good that can be drawn from arbitration would also be curtailed if any limit were put on the need of economical ex-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pansion, which is a vital question with vigorous nations. But, little by little, through the unceasing action of Socialism on all the internal conflicts of the nations, rules are being elaborated which can be applied to all disputes and conciliate the differences between nations without mutilating or unduly restricting the ambition of these nations. The future code of international arbitration is thus beginning to be outlined.

Here, it seems to me, are the principal rules which should characterize this arbitration code. In the first place, the new judges should not be called upon to settle any of our Old World troubles concerning territory torn from one country or another by the brutal spirit of force. There should be no attempt at "a revision of the map of Europe." The last traces of conquest in Poland, Ireland, Alsace-Lorraine and the Balkans should disappear under the benign influence of more generous home politics. International arbitration cannot well take in hand the righting of these great wrongs of the past. But, in a world appeased by the blessings of arbitration, liberty and autonomy would probably be given little by little to these historic groups and they would gradually secure a place in the family of nations without wholly breaking up the present territorial arrangements and bringing to the fore too irritating questions. We see something of this kind now going on in England, where the English working party upholds the Irish autonomists, who do not ask for a complete separation from Great Britain, but only for more freedom in the great English-speaking family. It is the same idea that governs the actions of the French Socialists in opposing the desire for "revenge" in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, and which prevails among the German Socialists in advocating a larger administrative, intellectual and moral liberty for both Alsace-Lorraine and Prussian Poland.

In the second place, it is not only from the brutalities of the past that we must find a way of escape. There must be a just and wise regulation of the economical warfare between nations. We Socialists can aid in this good cause by teaching that the bettering of the condition of the working classes should be placed before the desire for greater productive activity. This idea should be inculcated among all nations. There are in all countries deep layers of misery—thousands of men and women workers, who, if they were living under more humane conditions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and drew higher wages, would be larger buyers and thus would render home industries and the home markets stronger than the distant foreign markets against which the Capitalists of the various nations carry on such a fierce and constant war. This would be the severest blow that could be dealt to aggressive Imperialism. Consequently, the second law of international arbitration would be that the nations put an end to every monopoly and exclusive rights in any region not yet taken possession of by European nations, and where these nations are striving to develop their "influence."

This is the rule which was laid down by the Algeciras Conference in respect to Morocco; and if we French Socialists have been so firmly fighting against the recent French expedition to Morocco, it is not only because this expedition, in our eyes, was a violation of right, but especially because we saw in it the ruin, in an indirect way, of an international convention which had established for the nations an excellent rule for economic expansion. Algeciras had set a precedent. It proclaimed the principle of "no favors, no monopolies," "the open door for all" and "untrammelled competition for private enterprises and an honest adjudication of public improvements and governmental concessions." No nation could complain. No factitious advantage would change the natural conditions of its economic expansion. Each nation would conduct its trade in its own way and with vigor or lack of vigor, depending on its geographical position. None could feel that it was being checked in its vital energies by any other nation. Algeciras was, I repeat, a very happy precedent in the development of international law, and, in order to grasp its whole meaning, let us glance for a moment at a system of economic expansion conducted on the old and bad plan.

The Russian-Japanese war was not only most cruel and bloody, but it was foolish and unnecessary. There was room in Korea and Manchuria for the trading activity of both peoples, for both Russians and Japanese. But the grasping and selfish policy pursued by both Governments during a long period of years perverted the whole problem and precipitated a senseless conflict in the Far East. Outside nations could have made peaceful and advantageous arrangements with China and Korea by which all international jealousies and monopolies would have been avoided, and Russia and Japan would have reaped the benefit therefrom

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and a terrible war prevented. The Algeciras Conference showed the world how the principle of international arbitration can arrange trade matters and throw open new markets to all nations, while putting a check on grasping methods and ruinous competition among so-called civilized nations.

The third rule of the future code of international arbitration which we Socialists and the working classes can establish concerns the difficulties caused by emigration. There, of course, should be no exclusion of any kind. Capitalists who bring in foreign workmen should be bound to pay them according to fixed rates agreed upon by representatives of the workmen and representatives of the Capitalists. This subject was carefully gone into by the Stuttgart Congress, and the rules there laid down fit in nicely with the ideas on international arbitration.

And, finally, there must be a fourth rule concerning the exploiting of the inferior races by our "civilized" peoples, such as the abominable treatment now being meted out to the poor negroes of the Congo, and against which iniquity England and the United States have protested with so much force and success. The future code must protect these latest members of the coming family of nations. In fact, this humane reform is, I think, on the point of being accomplished.

It will be seen from what has just been said that arbitration is destined to be not an empty word, not a vain hope. The basis of the new law is now in process of formation. The essential elements of an arbitration code are being slowly but surely elaborated. There will be a territorial *status quo,* as far as Europe is concerned; larger liberties to peoples who are the victims of old-time conquests; internationalization of the world's new markets, and greater protection for inferior races. These blessings do not spring from the mind of plutocrats, but are born of the heart and wisdom of humanity under the still uncertain development of Socialism. But the good work will go on and become more precise and more systematic, until the world perceives the whole grandeur of international arbitration as conceived and worked out by modern Socialism.

JEAN JAURES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EGYPTIAN CALM.

BY SIR MARTIN CONWAY.

THE popular impression of the style of the arts of Ancient Egypt is that it was a changeless style; that, from beginning to end, Egyptian art obeyed a single canon and conformed to changeless laws. We shall find that this was not the case. The style of Egyptian art had its stages of nascence, culmination, decline and renascence, like the arts of other countries, races and periods. Yet it is true that all the art productions of Ancient Egypt, from the First Dynasty to the coming of Christianity, possess a certain quality so obvious as to be instantly recognizable by any one who has ever seen a few Egyptian antiquities and been told what they were. The average child at a Board School, if shown a photograph of a Fourth Dynasty pyramid, or a Nineteenth Dynasty bas-relief, or a Twenty-sixth Dynasty statue, or the latest Ptolemaic temple at Philæ, would instantly recognize each of them as Egyptian. Only about the earliest works, made when the style was in process of formation, would any doubt arise, in the mind of an ordinary educated person, as to whether it was Egyptian or not. It would be easy to cite individual works of art, and fine works, too, which even a cultivated amateur would hesitate to ascribe to a particular country or school. No such doubt arises about things Egyptian. Of whatever period (except the very earliest), and of whatever kind (architecture, sculpture, painting, goldsmithy, manuscript), they are distinguishable from the works of other schools; all alike exhibit the Egyptian style. Obviously, then, our first work must be to distinguish the characteristics of this style, the qualities by possession of which it consists, the qualities it lacks which later styles possessed.

If, for example, we were to set up side by side for comparison

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a sculptured figure from an Egyptian tomb and a terra-cotta statuette from Greece, any one could see at a glance that they belong to different categories of art. A world-epoch separates them. What is the fundamental quality absent from the Egyptian figure and present in the Greek? Is it not Grace? The Egyptian figure possesses merit, is good of its kind, monumental, simple, lucid, skilfully made—portraitlike, even, to a limited degree—but it is not graceful. The Greek terra-cotta possesses many defects, but in spite of them all it charms; and the quality by means of which it charms is its grace. Now, grace in a figure is a quality of motion and proportion. A graceful pose is one arrived at by graceful motion and, still suggesting the motion that led to it, suggests also sometimes motion to come. These suggestions of motion are most obviously perceptible in drapery, but they can likewise be plainly traced in the modelling of the surface of a body, even in the modelling of a face. In every work of Greek art, after the archaic period, evidence will be found of at least an effort on the part of the artist to express this ideal of grace. No such effort can be traced in Egyptian works. Egyptian artists rarely availed to represent motion, never graceful motion. As a rule, even their moving figures are as still as snap-shot photographs, the most motionless representations of moving figures produced in modern days. Look at the many pictures of wrestlers at Beni-Hasan, the ball-players in various tombs of the Middle Empire, the peasants driving cattle in tombs of the Ancient Empire,—it is the rarest thing for one of these images actually to suggest motion. Occasionally in a hunting scene there may be found a faint suggestion of the flight of a bird, or the movement of a beast, but never of that rushing torrent of motion relatively common with artists of the Pelasgian schools; and with them, though there is motion, there is never intentional grace of movement.

We know that the Egyptians were fond of looking on at exhibitions of dancing, but dancing among primitive peoples does not necessarily imply grace. I have seen dances performed by a number of different groups of semi-civilized natives in various parts of the world; but I can only remember one that was graceful, and I am sure that the grace was intended. As a rule, what the native onlookers applauded was vigor of dramatic action in the dancers. That probably was what the Egyptians expected. A

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

single bas-relief of the time of the New Empire, found at Gizeh, may perhaps be quoted as an exception; but, however graceful in actual fact may have been the movements of the dancing girls with their tambourines therein depicted, the grace escapes the sculptor. You have only to compare the Egyptian bas-relief with one of the well-known Greek Bacchantes to be assured of that.

If from sculpture we transfer our attention to architecture, a comparison of corresponding works enforces the same conclusion. Examine in succession pictures of one of the temples at Pæstum and the best part of the great temple of Amen-Ra at Karnak, the Hall of Columns. The Theban temple is far from being one of the finest Egyptian temples, though it is perhaps the most famous. It owes its fame to its monumental dignity, to the great boldness of the architect's—or perhaps the patron's—design; partly, also, to its mere antiquity. The fame of Pæstum is due to the beauty of the architecture and to nothing else. The main element of that beauty is perfection of proportions, likewise an element of grace. But architectural grace depends upon other qualities besides proportion, though it is not easy to set them down in words. Here, of course, motion has no part. A building might conceivably be designed in absolute perfection of geometrical proportions in all its parts, and yet might lack grace; for its last perfection seems to reside in those slight variations from absolute sameness of repetition, those individual touches, those small departures from machinelike accuracy, which imaginative architects have always permitted themselves to decree, thereby endowing with life and pleasant variety—with a kind of motion or play of form—what would otherwise have been a cold and rigid rendering in visible materials of a mathematical formula. The moving eye of the spectator ranging over a row of columns not absolutely one like another in every smallest detail, though all apparently alike, derives from them an impression not dissimilar to that derived from graceful motion, when the divergences from absolute identity of form and accuracy of equal spacing have been intentionally ordered by a creative mind.

In no ancient Egyptian building is found architectural grace of this kind. Sometimes good proportions are found, though at Karnak and Luxor even those are lacking. Egyptian architects of the New Empire, whose buildings alone survive, never sought

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

after grace, never felt the lack of it. They were striving to attain other perfections, to embody an ideal into which grace did not enter. Even in the days of the Ptolemies and Roman Emperors, though the influence of Greece was not unfelt in Egypt, Egyptian artists remained insensitive (and it is well that they so remained) to the new qualities which Greece had introduced into the artistic ideals of mankind. Ptolemaic temples are as purely Egyptian in all the qualities that make them architectural as the very pyramids themselves.

What is true of the sculptors and architects of Egypt is true of all her artists of every kind. Just as surely as Christianity brought Love into Religion, Greece brought Grace into Art. The arts of Egypt—and, for that matter, all the arts of all the pre-Hellenic schools, Chaldean, Assyrian, Minoan, Hittite—lack the quality that Greece gave to the world, and that has generally been regarded since as almost essential to a work of art. Yet absolutely essential Grace is not. Without it works of art, and great works, too, were made in Egypt; and their greatness depended upon other meritorious qualities never more grandly embodied in material form than by the ancient artists of the Valley of the Nile.

If we compare characteristic Assyrian and Egyptian works, we shall find ourselves enabled still further to define the boundaries of the Egyptian ideal. Take, for example, a battle scene from the bas-reliefs that once adorned the Palace of Sennacherib, and compare it with the representation of Rameses II fighting the Hittites; or set a hunting incident from the Palace of Sargon side by side with one from a tomb of the Ancient or Middle Egyptian Empire; or, perhaps best of all, compare the lion from the Palace gate of Assurnazirpal with the Egyptian lion now preserved near it in the British Museum—these, and many another similar comparison that might be made, prove at a glance that, while the technical skill of the artists of Egypt and Assyria is approximately on the same plane, and whilst both are approximately at the same stage of artistic development, the ideals of the two national schools are different. The ideal of the Assyrian artist may be described as an ideal of rage, of might, of physical power or force in action—qualities that are absent, and in the case of the Egyptian battle scenes lamentably absent, from the work of Egyptian artists. The Assyrian lion roars, and threatens

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the oncomer with teeth displayed. If the posture of his body (with its five legs) is purely conventional, the spirit of the beast is plainly enough expressed, and we readily admit that he is about to leap on his prey and tear it limb from limb. The Egyptian lion is no such tremendous beast. There is no rage in his expression, no threat in his pose. He is dignified, even benignant, in aspect. He suggests not war, but peace. The Assyrian beast is for driving the enemy from the gate or rending him with sudden destruction. The Egyptian lion does not dream that an enemy exists within mighty Pharaoh's range. He is not at hand to protect his master, but to accompany him with dignity and express his resistless might.

By continuing this process of comparisons and contrasts, we might make yet more plain, what is perhaps already evident enough, that the great virtue, the distinguishing quality, of the Egyptian ideal is the quality of Monumental Calm. This ideal of calm resulted from the concurrence of a number of circumstances, racial, geographical and temporal, at which we must briefly glance.

Egypt, as Herodotus said, is the gift of the Nile. The Egypt of the Ancient Empire and the prehistoric times that preceded it was the banks of the Nile, the narrow strip annually covered by the inundation, lying between the First Cataract and the apex of the Delta. In prehistoric times the banks of the river consisted of swamps and patches of jungle. The fertile, irrigated fields that have replaced both are the result of long-continued human labor. Irrigation and the canals necessary for it seem to have been a prehistoric invention, increased in historic times, and still in process of development under British direction. Irrigation implies government. Wherever water has to be distributed over a large area of cultivable land, law and administration are necessary and the people become disciplined. Thus in the remote valley of Hunza, in the Karakoran Mountains of Central Asia, the whole area of land upon which the Hunzakuts dwell is rendered fertile by the distribution over it of water diverted by a single bold canal from a glacier torrent. The Thum of Hunza controlled this canal, which passed immediately below his castle, and he thereby held the people in the hollow of his hand. The result was that the men of Hunza formed a better organized, better disciplined, body than any of the neighboring tribes.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hunza thus became a terror to its neighbors, notwithstanding the paucity of its possible population when every inch of cultivable ground was worked. It was the same with many of the tribes controlled by the Incas. They lived upon land that had to be artificially irrigated. The consequent organization of the folk led them to attain a higher civilization than was elsewhere reached in pre-Colombian South America.

Irrigation welded the mixed population of the Nile Valley into a state and gave them into the hands, first, of a series of local chiefs and, presently, of a King. Government in Egypt, except during recurring periods of political disease, was always strong. One dynasty of commanding monarchs succeeded another. Sometimes the Pharaoh was the local chieftain of one centre, sometimes of another, who raised himself to supreme power. Seldom for long together was the country divided between two or more rulers. Physical conditions forbade. The Nile made all Egypt one kingdom and gave despotic power to a single monarch. Thus the Egyptians were taught by nature to obey a ruler. They became the most submissive race of antiquity.

Nature also taught them the idea of law. Nowhere are the sequences of natural phenomena more orderly than in Egypt. The sky is seldom even flecked with clouds. Day by day the sun rises and sets in unveiled splendor. Night after night the countless glittering squadrons of the heavens march from horizon to horizon in unwavering procession. The seasons of the year begin and end with regularity. The rise and fall of the Nile, mysterious, wonderful, unfailingly recurs. Great must have been the effect of this visible orderliness of Nature upon a simple people. Naturally, invisible powers were conceived of by them as determining such regularity. The gods were very near them, irresistible divinities before whom they must needs bow down.

Again, the landscape of Egypt is essentially reposeful. It is so simple—the flat-topped edge of the desert plateau at a greater or less distance on either side of the Nile, cliff-fronted, delicate in tone; the broad stretch of almost flat land beneath; the silent, even-flowing river; the clear sky; the sparkling atmosphere; the broad, simple sweeps of color at sunrise and sunset. Beyond the habitable land—sheer desert; trackless; swallowed up in the blaze of daylight almost as completely as in the darkness of night; a burning, waterless, miserable land, irreclaimable, hopeless.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Finally, the climate of Egypt tended to impress the Egyptian with the same sentiment of calm. Building, as he naturally did, at the edge of the cultivable area, what he built, were it but fashioned of wood or sun-dried mud, lasted almost indefinitely. Nature conserves human handiwork in Egypt. Almost everywhere else Nature seems hastening to destroy it. Even the bodies of the dead, buried in the sand with little preparation, dried up rather than rotted away.

Thus the Egyptian expected regularity rather than change, expected the future to be like the past. His surroundings tended to make him obedient, contented, or at least resigned. Small wonder that, when Egypt produced artists, the ideal they devoted themselves to express was this national spirit of resignation and calm.

Fully as potent as these external forces and local circumstances upon the minds of the artists of Egypt was the Egyptian belief in a future life—itself, no doubt, the result of forces and circumstances still buried in the night of time. Amongst ancient peoples, the Egyptians had the reputation of being the most religious. We judge that they merited it. They were never a warlike folk. They were industrious and religious. Their faith included a multitude of factors still very obscure to us, but the largest factor, even at an early date, was obviously their belief in a future life. They held to that so strongly as to devote no inconsiderable part of the present life to making material preparations for the next. No proof of the genuineness of that part of their faith could be more convincing. Their art was powerfully influenced by this belief. It was to a large extent an art of the tomb, pervaded, therefore, by the serenity of death.

It is not to be supposed that we possess an accurate knowledge of what Egyptian religious ideas were. We can observe that they developed from age to age. Doubtless, they were never clearly defined. All such ideas are vague at any time and with any people. The following statement makes no claim to be complete or accurate. It only attempts to suggest in a general way the kind of notion which the average educated Egyptian held as to the constitution of his personality and the possibilities of his fate. In common with other folks at an early stage of intellectual development, the Egyptians believed that a human being consisted of at least two parts,—a body and a ghost, shadow or double. It

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was observed that in dreams persons were beheld whose bodies were not materially present. When a man fainted or slept, something seemed to go out of him; when he came to, or waked, that something came back. This was the double, the ghost—the "Ka," as they called it. The Ka was an impalpable thing, shaped like the body and behaving like it. Death was the separation of the Ka from the body. The Ka was conceived of as depending for its existence upon the body just as a shadow depends on the form that casts it. Annihilate the material form and you annihilate the shadow. Thus, if the Ka was to be kept in existence after death, the body, or at least the material shape of the body, must be kept in existence. This seems to have been the rudiment of the Egyptian idea of a future life. It was developed into a complex belief about which all sorts of legends were grouped. The Ka was to remain separated from the body for 10,000 years, during which time it was to pass a varied existence in the mysterious regions whither the sun voyaged in the night. After 10,000 years, Ka and body were to be reunited and a new earth-life was to begin. Thus the body, or its material shape, had to be preserved for 10,000 years. Hence came mummification, all the elaborations of the Egyptian tomb, and, most important, the invention of portrait sculpture—the purpose of the sculptured figure being to serve as a physical basis for the Ka in the event of the actual body being utterly destroyed.

It was not enough merely to keep the Ka in existence; it had likewise to be provided with comforts, occupations and possessions. If the double of a stone statue could be the double of a once living man, it was not difficult to conclude that the double of a stone loaf of bread might be equivalent to the double of a real loaf of bread. Now, a human Ka was believed to feed on the ghost of food, to be served by the ghosts of slaves and servants, to live in the ghost of a house, to own the ghost of an estate, to cultivate the ghost of ground, and generally to stand in need in the ghostly world of the ghosts of all the persons and things that a human being needs or enjoys in this world. The imagination only needed to be stretched a trifle further to satisfy itself that pictured images of all these things were as good foundations for their ghosts as sculptured images, at all events with the help of magic formulæ duly recited at propitious times by the descendants of the dead, or by priests, or even by pious persons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Thus the tomb became the house of the dead man's Ka, and its walls were covered with images of whatever he would need: a house, fields and their cultivators, servants engaged in all manner of industries—in fact, an entire epitome of contemporary Egyptian life. The whole strange development was logical enough once a few simple assumptions were made. The scheme was not peculiar to Ancient Egypt. We find traces of it from China to the Bay of Biscay. It lies at the root of the veneration of saints, the preservation of relics and the dedication of a church to this or the other saint whose relic is supposed to be preserved within it. The point specially noteworthy about Ancient Egypt is the logical manner in which the idea was worked out. The Egyptians were a peculiarly logical people, and their art was a logical art. They never went further with art than logic took them. There is no sign in any work of theirs of a leap of imagination. No divine revelation ever carried them off their feet or raised them into an ideal realm of pictured beauty. They remained always solidly planted with both feet on the soil of the Egypt that they knew.

Let me give a single instance of their logical procedure. If the ghost world was to be like their own Egypt, a Ka would be liable to be called upon to do forced labor on irrigation canals, perhaps, or in the fields of a King. Fancy some high priest of Amen-Ra or Royal Friend or other great personage's double thus distressed! How should the danger be avoided? A plan was duly evolved, and one of utmost simplicity. With the mummy were buried a number, sometimes hundreds, of little mummy figures made in clay, porcelain, wood or stone, each provided with a hoe or mattock. On each was written an inscription to this effect: "When you hear the name of such an one [the dead man] called, say, 'I am here.'" These figures were, therefore, called "respondents." It is no exaggeration to say that they have been found by hundreds of thousands in the excavated tombs of ancient Egypt.

It will now be evident enough how it came to pass that the art of Egypt, as we know it, was so largely affected by the idea of a future life. It was the great agency by which a future life was to be secured for the dead. Most well-to-do people saw to their own future comfort for themselves while they were alive, and even made provision for the performance at their tombs forever of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anniversary ceremonies for the comfort and sustenance of their own ghosts. No man is likely to feel particularly sad about his own ghost, or to waste much sentiment upon it. If he thinks it is going to have a good time, he will probably regard it with complacency. Hence the art of the Egyptian tomb is not at all sad. On the contrary, it is particularly cheerful. The painted and sculptured subjects represent every-day occupations, and the words put into the laborers' mouths are the ordinary remarks of peasants, not lamentations or prayers. It follows that we need not look for the expression of deep emotion, or for elevation of sentiment, or even for resignation, but for the matter-of-fact attitude of mind of a man overseeing his household and ordering his dinner. There is no trace of any idea of sin or evil, of repentance, redemption, expiation, or any such ideas. Only in later days, when the priestly caste had obtained an unhealthy predominance in the country, do we find the walls of tombs (almost always royal tombs) encumbered with pictured allegories of the muddy theology of an overgrown and overfed body of priests. These things are not art and do not call for our attention. They need only be mentioned to be dismissed.

If, then, the emotions which death engenders in the living, the sense of loss, the pity, sorrow and resignation which survivors experience, are all absent from the Egyptian tomb, wherein, it may be asked, did the idea of a future life affect Egyptian art?

I reply that all the works of art buried in an Egyptian tomb were intended to last 10,000 years. That intention governed the artists and reacted upon the style of the Art of Egypt. It is a most important fact—perhaps the most important and fundamental fact that the student of Egyptian art has to remember. There was no place for passion in such an art; none for grace; none even for charm. Each figure had merely to be made lucid—plainly occupied about its business or visibly shaped in the form required, and that was all. The art of the Egyptian tomb was to serve a useful purpose, not to please. The arts of the temple and the palace might be required to please; not so the arts of the tomb. Had there been no temples, no palaces and no growth of art in them, the tombs, for all the figures and drawings they contained, would never have produced anything that should properly be called art at all. For art exists to please and has no other reason for existing. Things made merely for use are not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

works of art. Egyptian art, therefore, did not arise in the tomb. It arose aboveground and had its life there; but it was applied, and so voluminously applied, to the tomb as to be greatly affected and severely injured by that application. It was injured by the fact that so large a part of the energies of Egyptian artists were employed upon the production of works intended to be buried as soon as made. It was affected not wholly unfavorably by the conservatism of form thus encouraged and by the simplicity, directness and veracity proper to figures and paintings intended to be the doubles of actual every-day life.

Buried figures made in limestone, wood or even clay might endure forever in Egypt, but those exposed to the gaze of men would not so endure unless their substance was of unusual strength or their size colossal. The Egyptian habit of mind, trained by contemplation of that long future of ten thousand years, demanded above all things endurance. It chanced, or was decreed by the same evolution that produced the Egyptians themselves, that they dwelt in a land which provided them with the hardest rock suitable for sculpture and with great masses of rock capable of being carved *in situ* into such images as their ideal demanded. Thus nature and man were in harmony. The obedient Egyptians, governed by a mighty Pharaoh, living their lives in a land where the irresistible forces of Nature visibly operated with recurrent regularity; believing, too, in a future life the duplicate of the present; not looking for change, nor turning their attention to lands beyond the isolated valley in which they lived cut off from the rest of the world—developed an ideal of majestic, calm, enduring power, and learned how to express it in great sculptured figures, wide-extended ponderous buildings, colossal pyramids and vast rock-cut interiors. They learned to fashion the hardest rocks into the simple forms their art demanded. They learned finally to give to small objects the dignity they had devised in the handling of great masses, and even to design on their flimsiest papyrus manuscripts decorations as majestic as those which covered the walls of their temples, and which still produce upon modern visitors an impression of monumental majesty and everlasting calm such as no other artists of the world have ever equalled, still less surpassed.

Later races have produced nobler and far more comprehensive works of art. Egyptian art responds to but a small group of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

human emotions. It selects very little out of the infinite complexity of nature. It awakens only a small area of our sympathies. But what it attempted to do, it succeeded in doing with a success that is absolute. You may go beyond the ideal of Egypt in every direction, but within the limits of that ideal you cannot surpass it. The Egyptian Sphinx, for example, is a perfect type. Modern artists sometimes try to improve it—with what failure let the modern Sphinxes at the base of Cleopatra's Needle on the Thames Embankment bear witness. No one has ever succeeded in making a better figure in the Egyptian style than Egyptian artists made. The best colossal statues in the world still erect are those called of Memnon at Thebes, wrecked though they be; the best rock-hewn statues those of Rameses at Abu Simbel. To make such works, a people in the ancient Egyptian stage of development, animated by a simple majestic idea, were requisite. It was likewise requisite that they should not only live when, but in the very kind of country where, the Egyptians actually lived. Providence brought the race, the ideal and the necessary material surroundings together, and Egyptian art was the result. We may enjoy it, learn from it, preserve or destroy it, but we cannot imitate it.

Thus it is with all the ideals that have ever obtained complete artistic expression. They have attained it at some definite time and in some definite place at the hands of a people in a definite stage of development. The works in which it is enshrined are inimitable, for the circumstances of their production cannot recur. The art of Egypt, however, is remarkable, not only for the ideal it enshrines, but for the perfect clearness with which that ideal is expressed. Other ideals have reigned for a short period—a century, perhaps two or even three centuries; the Egyptian ideal was patiently elaborated and contentedly expressed during some 4,000 years, not without developments of detail, but without fundamental change. The reward of this patience and persistence was the utter clearness and approximate perfection which the artists attained in the expression of their ideal, not in one or two arts only, but in all the arts simultaneously. Other schools of art have been greater in one art than in another, have adapted their ideal to painting, or sculpture, or architecture, as the case may be. The Egyptians attained an equal success in all the arts as far as they carried them. Their painting, sculpture,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

decoration, architecture and all the so-called minor arts are alike excellent in their several kinds and absolutely harmonize one with another. It is not possible to say that one is subordinated to another. Never was a single style more completely carried through the whole fabric of a national life than the Egyptian. Even Greece was inferior to Egypt in this respect. Egypt alone could afford the time for the complete development of her simple style, and the complete expression of her simple ideal, in her national life and art. For this reason, if for no other, the works of art which have been so miraculously preserved to us in the land of the Nile are worthy of patient study and pious preservation. Perfection is not attainable by man, even when raised to the rank of artist. The greatest artists are often greatly imperfect. Witness Leonardo da Vinci and Michel Angelo. Great schools of art in the days of their culminating power may only succeed in suggesting faintly, by comparison with what might have been, the glory that their ideal would have manifested if it could have attained complete expression. Of the ideal of Egypt we may say that it was adequately, indeed completely, expressed. All that it had to yield was drawn from it. Further in that direction man could not proceed. That is the title to glory of the ancient Egyptians, and for that they will be honored so long as the history of art remains a subject in which men take interest.

MARTIN CONWAY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ALDRICH-VREELAND BILL, AND ITS PLACE.

BY THEODORE GILMAN.

Now that the method of issuing bank currency through voluntary corporations composed of associated national banks has been made part of the banking laws of the United States, by the enactment of the Aldrich-Vreeland bill, with the object of preventing monetary panics, it devolves upon those who approve of the principle of the measure to show its place in republican banking legislation, and to establish its claim to be wise, safe and efficient. This law is without precedent, because never before in the history of the financial world has there been an attempt to construct a banking system of, by and for the people. A departure from precedents, especially in banking methods, is so unusual as to constitute an era in banking; and it is well to pause at the threshold of the subject to inquire into the reasons for this radical change. Does it stand the test of the principles laid down by the authorities? Is it in the nature of an experiment and above all can it be justified by experience?

1. The currency question is a practical one. That is, its solution must be arrived at by experience, and not by theories. After two hundred years of experience, the nature of credit is as well understood as the properties of steam, gravitation, electricity or any other power. The necessity for safety valves, buffers and insulators is the same now as when steam, gravity and electricity were first harnessed. The necessity for reserves is the same now as when, in 1697, the Bank of England suspended cash payments because it was attempting to do business on a cash reserve of less than three per cent. of its demand liabilities. The rule of probabilities, on which the credit system is based, works approximately the same now as it has worked at any

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time during the last two hundred years. It is true now as it always has been that there are probabilities which govern ordinary and extraordinary circumstances. These aspects of the currency question have been discussed for centuries by practical business men, lawmakers and economists of the greatest ability and clearness of perception; and it must not be thought that anything new can be said on the subject which has not been said before. Nor should it be expected that any new plan, or device, or experiment can be suggested which has not been tried or elaborated or proposed at some time in the past. The currency question is all of one piece, from the time the credit system was established in 1694 by the founding of the Bank of England, down to the present time. The laws of credit cannot be violated now with less chance of punishment than at any previous time.

The situation of our currency discussion, in and out of Congress, has been called a chaos, and it is so only because every scheme, meritorious or worthless, which has been promulgated during the past two centuries, has had an advocate now and all these voices have joined in the general hubbub. The practical method of testing by experience will make short work with many of these plans. There is the history of the French assignats, of the South Sea Bubble, of government fiat money in England and the United States, of uncontrolled bank-note currency which produced the panic of 1837, of the English panics of 1847, 1857, 1866 and 1890, and our own of 1873, 1893 and 1907, all giving a fund of experience by which to rectify past mistakes and guide future action. There are also, to be used as warnings, the instances where false theories have been incorporated into a country's banking system, like those in the English bank charter of 1844 and like our own bond-secured currency of 1861, which can with difficulty be got rid of even after their falsity has been exposed and acknowledged for decades. There is no lack of painful experience which has burned its evil effects into men's minds by untold disasters. There have also been favorable experiences of good systems of banking, which have been of the greatest benefit to the countries served by them, of which the chief example is the French. There have been important principles established by the long currency discussions in our country, which must be preserved as absolutely essential under a free republican form of government. The practical method in considering these cases

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

affords the surest and best guide by which to arrive at sound and correct conclusions, for that will lead us to take the course which has been proved by experience to be productive of good results and to shun the path which has brought us or any other country to trouble.

2. As the settlement of our currency question is a practical matter, we must look for the reasons why our banking system has worked badly. The times when it works well are not under consideration. The question should not be what was the cause of any particular one of the panics which have swept over our country, but, was there not a cause which was common to them all? There has been no change in our national banking system since 1861, and therefore the inquiry may be properly limited to that period. It is pertinent, then, to ask why our system has not carried us over those years from 1861 to the present time without monetary disorder. During those forty-seven years, France has had no money panic, though it has experienced severe commercial convulsions. Its capital, even, was occupied by a foreign army, and it paid an enormous indemnity to free itself from the presence of the enemy. The business troubles of France have been as great as ours, or even greater—to wit, the collapse of the copper syndicate in 1880, and the failure of the Panama Canal Company. New York has not been occupied by a foreign army in that time, and we cannot claim that our circumstances are exceptional and afford a satisfactory explanation for our many breakdowns. The fact remains that the French system protected that country from money troubles, while our system has not protected us.

We cannot ascribe our money panics, therefore, to anything outside of our banking system. It is the kind of system we are working under, and not the kind of business we are doing, which is the cause of our panics. The defect in our system is simple and the mode of relief is simple. The defect was pointed out at the time the New York law of 1838 was enacted, after which our National Bank Act was modelled in 1861. It is no new thing. The defect is, perhaps, described best in the edition of the "Encyclopedia Britannica" of that time. It is that, when a demand for money arises, it must be met from reserves of lawful money, because a bond-secured currency does not respond to the demands of business. Each draft on the reserves entails a reduction of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about three times as much credit. The process is like taking away the foundations of a house. When enough of it is taken away, the superstructure must collapse. The only way to protect reserves under our present system is by calling in loans and refusing to renew accommodations. This puts a pressure on borrowers, who thereupon seek loans in the open market at rising rates of interest. The money to grant these loans is withdrawn by private lenders from the banks, which withdrawals still further reduce their reserves and compel them to increase their demands on borrowers. If at the same time alarming events occur, the public become excited and distrustful and begin to hoard currency, knowing that reserves are inadequate and a suspension of cash payments is inevitable. The National Bank Act gives no relief, for under it the banks can protect their reserves only by forcing liquidations, and the process must go on, unless the banks can get outside relief, until the demand for money is lessened by the prostration of business. So it is evident that the legal way under our present system to protect the banks is by methods which cause panics.

This is the so-called restrictive system and is in vogue in England and the United States. Under this system a panic is ended by the exhaustion of borrowers and the stoppage of business, or by methods outside of the law. The restrictive system is incorporated, and it may be said concealed, in the 95th section of the National Bank Act, where it is prescribed that, when the reserves of a bank are impaired, it must not increase its loans, and if the reserves are not restored in thirty days, a receiver for the bank may be appointed. To restore reserves, a bank must decrease its loans. The correct name for such a system of banking is the "Panic System," and certainly our national act has earned that title in the past forty-seven years, for in that time we have had lesser panics almost every year and full-blown panics at regular intervals.

3. It is very evident that the simple remedy for this defect is to create some source to issue a credit currency to meet these temporary demands on the banks, so that they may retain their reserves undiminished and not be compelled to call loans and afflict borrowers. This is called the "Expansive System." It is no new suggestion, for it was made by Sir Francis Baring in 1797, by the Bullion Report in 1810, by Robert Hare in 1837,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by Henry Dunning McLeod in 1893 and by many others. The history of finance in this country and elsewhere shows that money panics have all been caused by the operation of the restrictive system, and they have been cured, from the first recorded modern panic of 1793 to the present day, by the expansive system. The principle of the expansive system was successfully incorporated into French banking by the short and easy method of conferring a monopoly of issue on the Bank of France. But a monopoly is odious in the eyes of Anglo-Saxons, and the attempt to adopt the expansive system in our country by the establishment of a United States Bank met its Waterloo in the conflict with our principles of popular government and individual initiative. The United States Bank was not destroyed because it was inefficient and failed of its object, but because it was not in harmony with our free institutions, and one or the other had to go.

The next step in our banking history was a fatal one. The power of issue was allowed to independent State banks with no central bank to which they might appeal for aid. This was an unconscious abandonment of the expansive for the restrictive system. The lawmakers of that time did not know what a dangerous step they were taking or what frightful consequences would result therefrom. Business was prosperous for a while; but, when distrust came, there was no way by which the banks could protect themselves except by the restrictive method of forcing liquidations. The outcome was the severest example of the results of the restrictive system the world ever saw. The losses were estimated at six thousand millions of dollars. The losses on banking capital were stated by the United States Almanac for 1843 to have been $248,000,000, and on bank circulation and deposits $54,000,000. The annihilation of values was almost inconceivable. At sheriff's sale in Ohio, horses were sold at two dollars each, cows at one dollar each, and in Missouri sheep at thirteen and a half cents each, a large ox at twelve and a half cents, twenty-four hogs at twenty-five cents for the lot, stacks of hay at twenty-five cents each, and so on. As a result of forced liquidations of all kinds of property and consequent prostration of business, much of the bank currency was paid, after considerable delay, at par. It was made good at the expense of a holocaust of credit and values.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It must not be supposed that these troubles came upon this country because of prevailing ignorance of the subject of credit, and for lack of sound opinions and good advice. It is sufficient to cite the suggestion of one financial writer. When the supporting power of the Bank of the United States was taken away by President Andrew Jackson, and the power of issue was given to many independent banks, Robert Hare* published in Philadelphia a pamphlet, dated 1837, inscribed to Mahlon Dickerson, Secretary of the Navy, in which he showed the necessity of some scheme to support the banks in an emergency. He wrote as follows:

"I would have the existing banks, or as many as would concur, to resolve themselves in their individual capacity into offices of deposit and discount, and in their joint capacity into a general loan office, under the authority of the national Government. In one capacity, they are to relinquish all right to issue loans on personal security or to receive deposits subject to order; in their separate capacity, they are to relinquish all right to issue bank notes or bills of credit payable to bearer or any form of bank notes or paper credit which enter into circulation so as to act as money without endorsement. Thus the branch offices will become the progenitors of the general office, instead of the general office being the parent of the branch offices. No member of the association can issue notes for which he does not previously give security. The national circulation would not be under the control of one corporation, a predicament so objectionable to many, but under the control of trustees appointed by the confederated banks, and the duties of these trustees defined both by the deed of trust and the laws under which it should be executed."

If this simple plan had been carried into effect, we would have had an expansive system of banking which would have protected this country from the panics which have occurred in the past seventy years. The combination would have been like the Hanseatic League of the twelfth century, which is said to have protected the commerce of the Hanse towns without a failure for two centuries. But the times were not ripe for such a scheme, for banks were not then accustomed to associate themselves in clearing-houses, and the lawmakers of that time in Congress made banking a football for politics, instead of a practical business proposition.

* Robert Hare, 1781–1858. An American writer on scientific, financial and other topics. He was a friend of Priestley, Seybert and Woodhouse. The American Academy of Boston awarded him the first Rumford medal for his inventions. Yale College gave him an honorary degree. He was a man of marked ability and influence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

4. After both the central bank and the independent bank schemes had been discredited, there came a revulsion of sentiment against all banking, and banking was prohibited in some States. It seemed that barter and bullion afforded the only satisfactory way of conducting business. But the demands of modern life asserted themselves, and a forward effort was made to bring banking into conformity with the spirit of freedom which animated and controlled all hearts. Then was done pioneer work in the untried field of republican banking legislation. The two principles which were established by the discussions which followed 1837 were, first, that special bank charters should cease and that banking thereafter should be done under a general law; and, second, as a necessary consequence of the creation of many independent banks, that the power of issue should be separated from the ordinary functions of banking and that banks must deposit security with an officer of the State for all currency issued by them. Legislators saw that in no other way could a general law safely be framed that was to be free and open to all. The temptation to an unwise use of the power of issue was one which even the directors of the Bank of England could not resist, much less the directors of hundreds of small banks in the United States. The act of the legislature of New York in 1838 embodying these principles was hailed at the time as a new declaration of independence.

Thus free banking and the securing of bank currency with property in the hands of a trustee, were established as the cornerstones of republican banking. It is to be noticed that these two principles were not intended to abrogate the principle of expansion as the true means of meeting and controlling monetary troubles. They were rather the necessary steps in the growth and development of republican legislation on the subject. At the time it was expected that the secured currency would expand and contract to meet the wants of business; but the object chiefly aimed at then was to make the currency safe by a pledge of collateral. The defect of inelasticity, as has been said, was seen and commented on immediately on the passage of the New York law of 1838.

When the National Bank Act was framed in 1861, it of necessity followed the New York law of 1838 on the two points named. It was a general law which provided a secured cur-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rency. Congress would have stultified itself if it had followed any other model. The security, however, was changed from municipal bonds and real-estate mortgages to bonds of the United States. That the two principles are good is shown by the successful operation of the national banks, and that there has never been any question as to the goodness of the national bank currency. The only criticism is the old one, that the currency does not respond to the demands of business and that those demands must be responded to by squeezing borrowers.

5. Basing their objections on this one defect of inelasticity, there are those now who would wish to see the expansive system re-established by abandoning both the cardinal republican principles of a general law and a secured currency. They would give up the general law and go back to the branch banking system, or to a central bank with a special charter. They have proposed a "frank abandonment" of security for currency, and in some way or other to allow banks to issue currency on their own responsibility. These proposals have been advocated with a tenacity of purpose and a wealth of resource which proves that those who support them are terribly in earnest. There is only one reason why these efforts, on which so much time and money have been lavished, have not been successful. That is that, deep down in the heart of the American people, there is an ideal of the basis of our government; and the people recognize, and their representatives recognize, that a central bank, or a branch banking system, or a currency issued on the responsibility of individual banks, does not conform to that ideal.

In a republic, the people govern, and all authority delegated by them is delegated for a set period, at the end of which it must be returned and surrendered to them. The Government is the servant and creature of the people, not their master. If that principle does not enter into the fundamental law of a land, its Government is not republican. A banking system in a republic must partake of the same political character as the Government. Our people approved of separate individual banks because they were free and independent. To any proposal which would take away that independence, the country simply answered "No." But when Congress, out of the many plans before it, selected the one creating associations of banks, which associations were the creatures and servants of the banks composing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them, whose officers held only delegated authority, which was after short periods to be returned to the associated banks, then the country saw that this was the republican idea carried into banking. Such associations are diametrically opposite in principle to a central bank, and this explains why the Republican party voted nearly unanimously in favor of the Aldrich-Vreeland bill.

The main provision of this bill is that only associations representing groups of banks shall issue bank currency. It is evident that the sovereign power to create money or currency should not be delegated by Congress without the most perfect guarantees that it will not be abused. The only method thus far devised in any civilized country to secure such guarantees is to separate the functions of issue from those of deposit and discount. That is the principle established by the New York law of 1838, by the National Bank Act of 1861, and it is now perpetuated in the Aldrich-Vreeland bill of 1908. In France, there are thousands of popular banks, many with large capital; but only one institution has the power to issue—the Bank of France. If a local bank in France, like the Credit Lyonnais, which has a capital of $40,000,000, should need currency on account of a local financial disturbance, or from any other cause, it must send to the Bank of France acceptable securities in the shape of bills receivable or convertible bonds and stocks, and ask a discount. If the collaterals are approved, the Bank of France would immediately forward its notes for the proceeds of the discount. The separation of the two functions in France, as far as the popular banks are concerned, is thus complete. In Germany, there are also thousands of popular banks, but only half a dozen with the power of issue. It is expected that the power of issue of these half dozen will in time be absorbed by the Imperial Bank. Thus in Germany, also, the separation of the two functions is complete. These two nations have not enforced this separation without reason or a struggle. The *reason* is that directors of local, popular banks cannot be restrained within conservative limits in the exercise of the power of issue. The temptation of profit has beclouded, and always will overcome and becloud, judgment. The *struggle* was to force the popular banks to relinquish the right of issue, which was accomplished by drastic governmental measures. The history of banking in every civ-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ilized country, during the past century, shows a succession of acts limiting the power to issue bank currency within increasingly narrow limits. Separation of the function of issue from those of deposit and discount induces caution and conservative action. The popular bank must submit its collateral securities to the inspection of the association, which is the bank of issue. The latter takes the risk of the loan and will require the best the popular bank can give. The security has first been approved by the popular bank and then is reviewed by the bank of issue. There is no safer use of money than in such loans; and, consequently, the Government can safely delegate to an association of banks the power to create currency for popular use, when the loans on which it is based are made in this careful and conservative manner.

6. It has been said above that the remedy for our currency troubles is simple. The Aldrich-Vreeland bill shows how simple the method is. The National Currency Associations provided in that bill would occupy towards all national banks the position of the Bank of France towards the local banks of that country. The position would be even a better one; for the Bank of France, through its branches, competes with all French banks for local and national business, while currency associations would not do a general banking business. The evils of centralization, under which the provinces groan, would be avoided. In discussing the Aldrich-Vreeland bill, we must assume that Congress will abolish the almost prohibitive and unnecessary tax on circulation of from five to ten per cent. Congress constructed a fine machine with all necessary safeguards, and then clogged the wheels. If only Congress will take off the clogs, the country can then see how the machine will work. Assuming that the five to ten per cent. tax is removed, it is evident that, when the time of year comes for moving crops, interior banks in the crop sections would apply to their National Currency Associations for loans of currency. In anticipation of these demands, the associations would have on hand a supply of currency ready for issue. Immediately on approval of the securities offered, the notes would be forwarded to the interior banks asking the loans. Thus, without any pressure on the commercial communities in Eastern cities, and without causing any rise in the rate for money, the enormous crops of our country would be moved to market and the initial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business operation of the year would be completed. Banks in the East would not be called on for currency, as it would be supplied where the demand originated. Thus one trip across the country would be saved. All that is required of Eastern banks by the bill is to accept the currency at par, when it would be charged up to some account or redeemed at Washington, and on the trip back it would be a cancelled voucher. The present cumbersome method of sending the currency on a trip of from one to three thousand miles would be avoided. The issues by banks in central cities would thus be small.

The principle of the bill is co-operation. Ex-Secretary Shaw said, in his last report to Congress, that he was repeatedly informed that co-operation was impossible. Who made that remark, the Honorable Secretary did not state. It would be well if the country knew. It is evident that co-operation was impossible before this bill was enacted. The restrictive system is one of internecine strife or civil war. Every man's hand is against his neighbor. Banks are in the business to make money under the system which the lawmaking power has constructed, whatever it is. They have and feel no responsibility for the effects on the public which their legal acts may entail. That responsibility they rightly place on the lawmakers. This is shown by their operations under the National Bank Act. When banks in New York were remonstrated with for calling loans on a stringent money-market, thereby aggravating an already demoralized situation, the brutally frank reply was given, "Call loans were made to call." It is considered good banking to keep as near the twenty-five per cent. reserve limit as possible, and rely on squeezing the public to restore delinquent reserves. This is conformity to the law under the restrictive system. The banks are in the saddle. They say in effect, "Let the galled jade wince, our withers are unwrung." Co-operation is a new idea for the banks. Yet it is only reasonable that since the banks owe their lives, that is their charters, to the public will, it is their duty to reciprocate by doing whatever the welfare of the country demands of them. They should be willing to co-operate heartily in any plan that is for the good of the people. It must be remembered that in the history of banking, no reform was ever made at the suggestion of the banks. The strong arm of the Government was needed to carry through the Aldrich-Vree-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

land bill, for it was not favored by the banks; to them it was a heart-breaking disappointment. It was freely predicted that the idea of associated banks could never be reported by a Congressional Committee, for who, they said, is behind it? All moneyed interests were opposed to it, and yet it has prevailed only because it is the republican way of solving the currency question.

7. The most important point to be guarded in any expansive system is the contraction needed to restore the power for another expansion. Until the bent bow straightens itself, it cannot shoot another arrow. The capital which moves this year's crops must be returned in time to move the next. Therefore, redemption funds and agencies should be ample. But, more important still, the basis of bank currency should be commercial paper having but a short time to run. The movement of crops and goods to the market is represented by such paper. These are operations which are completed in a few months and are connected with the active business life of the country. Currency is designed to facilitate such business.

It is very evident also, and has been proved often by the experience of our clearing-houses, that, if currency is supplied by associated banks, there is a firm but gentle pressure on the borrowing bank to take up its loan, and repay their advances at the earliest practicable moment. The National Currency Association, which represents the associated banks, is responsible for the payment of the advances, and it desires to end that responsibility as soon as is possible. The movement of the crops takes place in a few months. The money derived from the sale of the crops is then in hand to redeem the notes; and, though redemption may come naturally at the end of the operation, because the currency has done its work, the pressure from the associated banks is needed to enforce redemption, so that an effectual contraction shall take place to restore the power to expand when the next season arrives. The expansive system is safe only if the currency is based chiefly on short-date commercial paper. The restrictive and expansive systems both supply money to move the crops. One does it at the expense of the commercial community, the other at the expense of a little inconvenience to the banks, which, instead of calling loans, will have to go to the National Currency Associations to get whatever their customers need.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A loan from a currency association is not a perquisite which a bank may demand as a right. It is a lawful loan, made subject to the approval of a committee composed of experienced bankers, who have a contingent interest in any loss which may result therefrom. This committee is one remove from the importunity of borrowers, which separation insures calm, deliberate and conservative action. A committee selected from the directors of different banks will, presumably, have acquaintance with the commercial houses of their States, and would be desirous of promoting and developing all legitimate local business interests. Centralization would thereby be avoided. From the above it is concluded that the five to ten per cent. Government tax is unnecessary.

8. The Aldrich-Vreeland bill contains its own confession that it is not a finality. It is like the Constitution of the United States, which, as ratified and made operative, contained the essential principles of our Government. But ten necessary Amendments were added within a few years. So now the framers of this bill have already begun the work of its development into a permanent system. Besides the removal of the oppressive and obstructive tax of five to ten per cent. it would be an improvement to make the system more inclusive. While the national banks should be made pre-eminent and predominant, as they are in the bill, State banks should not be excluded from currency associations, if they conform to the requirements of the National Bank Act as to reserves and in other respects. They might, at least, be made associate members, without the right to vote or hold office.

There is an objection also to corporations which are only to do business occasionally, or perhaps once a year. When they start up, they are apt to be rusty. It would be far better to incorporate our clearing-houses, which are in continuous operation, and with which banks are brought into constant contact. There might be competition or conflict between National Currency Associations and the present clearing-houses. This possibility would be obviated by the inclusion of clearing-houses. In addition to these considerations, it would be well for the business public to have all banking functions brought into one system. Arbitrary and oppressive action by these unincorporated bodies would thereby be prevented.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

9. The Aldrich-Vreeland bill for the first time places the expansive system on our statute books. The union of national banks in National Currency Associations follows closely the plan proposed by Robert Hare in 1837. It is also in accord with the dictum on which Henry Dunning McLeod bases his Theory of Credit, and which he states in the following words:

"In the modern system of credit it is indispensably necessary that there should be some source to create and issue solid credit to sustain solvent houses in a monetary panic."

Whatever the defects of this bill, it should be a matter of national rejoicing that this principle has at last been embodied in our banking laws. Defects may be cured by subsequent legislation; but, in spite of them, this law has sufficient power to protect the country against monetary panics in the future. The enactment of the expansive principle in this bill marks an epoch in the history of banking in our country.

The first general banking law the world ever saw was enacted by the legislature of New York in 1838, when the Whig party was in control. The first national banking system was created by Congress in 1861 with the Republican party in control; and now the same party is bringing the work of republican banking legislation to its final and perfect form and logical conclusion.

THEODORE GILMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MORALS OF THE MODERN HEROINE.

BY ELIZABETH BISLAND.

FUNDAMENTAL morals alter but little from age to age, some general law of behavior being required to make feasible the life in common. Thou shalt not kill: Thou shalt not steal, nor lie, nor covet thy neighbor's wife, are the four cornerstones of society. But while these basic laws have been what a young Japanese poet—in a moment of lyric ardor—has called "the social glue," there is no one thing more subject to the vagaries of fashion than the smaller morals, so to speak; those refinements of thought and behavior which form the morals of the non-criminal classes—such folk as ourselves, who have daily to beg that we may not be led into temptation, but who rarely even contemplate any real egregiousness of conduct.

Can one imagine, for example, any two standards farther apart —more separated by the whole diameter of thought—than those of a wealthy young New-Yorker who interests himself in reform work in the East Side slums, and those of a young Roman patrician of the time of the great Julius? And yet both of these men would give adherence to the simpler code, that murder, theft, lying and cowardice were unthinkable temptations. The Roman would look upon the modern sociologist as a fantastic fool, and the earnest young reformer would consider the Italian as no better than a gross and selfish pagan, and yet both would be gentlemen, with a lofty sense of duty.

Of course, these fashions in ethics profoundly affect literature, that mirror of the human mind in which we see reflected not only our own faces, but also the faces of all our ancestors; in which we see depicted our physical and moral lineaments; in which we find the semblance of our ideals and the ideals of those who have created us and our aspirations. When we wish

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to study the constantly mutable fashion in morals, we must turn to the library shelves and contemplate the records there made of the hopes and beliefs of each generation.

In our European civilization there has always been a deliciously contradictory attitude in the mind of the male—until recently the general maker of our literature—toward his female. While never willing to admit her equality with himself, either mental or moral, he has yet constantly required of her, has constantly urged upon her, a certain sublimation of behavior which he was amiably reluctant to demand of himself or of his fellows. The *ewigeweibliche*—the eternal feminine—of his dream has seesawed between the passionless goddess and the greedy child. Gray-eyed Athene—pure wisdom and justice—"stern daughter of the voice of God," and that naughty blooming lady who came glowing from the sea to set all men by the ears, were equally his ideal of our unlucky sex. Naturally, it has kept us busy trying to assume both parts satisfactorily; and, considering how earnestly we have endeavored to meet these conflicting demands upon our moral talents, it does seem hard that we have earned only a general and invidious reputation for capriciousness and incomprehensibility. "*Souvent femme varie?*" One would think so, indeed, under such stress for versatility!

In the early literatures one finds the heroine, the ideal woman, varying from Antigone to Medea; from Phædra to Penelope; and, tucked in between these extremes of virtues and vices on the heroic scale, there has been an endless chain of rosy, laughing, comfortable young persons with the morals of rabbits and the mentality of butterflies. From the relish with which the classic authors lingered over the charms of these ladies' persons, and the piquancy of their daring improprieties, one rather suspects that, on the whole, these latter were the ones they found most to their taste, though in their loftier moments they imagined their heroines in nobler mould.

The coming of Christianity swept both types into the Index Expurgatorius, and substituted the hysteric saint of visions and macerations. Here was a brand-new character for the overworked female to enact; yet, in her facile good-nature, she threw herself into the required attitude with the old enthusiasm. The very quaintest heroine of all fiction is to be found in the Lives of the Saints, while the Early Fathers were calling her by the most

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opprobrious names—damning her up and down, and she patiently going into ecstasies and never answering back! No wonder the male of our kind has said we were incomprehensible!

In the golden dawn of the Renaissance the mystic and the saint paled and vanished; and, instead, came "the white feet of Nicolette," stepping shyly to meet "that sweet knight Aucassin," followed by golden-headed Guinevere, Beatrice, Iseult of the silver hands and the lily maid of Astolat. Personally, I must say, these are my favorites of all *les belles dames de temps jadis,* with their braided locks and folded hands, their meek lashes and fine pale brows—ladies all fire and dew; all passion and tender grace.

As the classic revival rose to its zenith, these, too, passed, and the frisky young person reappeared, and with her the severe and lofty heroine, sharing the homage of the man in love with the shadow of antiquity.

It was a sort of a hybrid cross between the two who stalked and strutted through the interminable pages of Mlle. de Scudéry's romances and the verbose volumes of Richardson. Bernard Shaw says that the men of the eighteenth century did not regard woman as an individual, but as an institution, and the heroine of the eighteenth-century romance, "the delicate female," was merely the reflection, the feminine shadow, of the Man of Feeling—that intolerable prig, "whose mild eye," the poet tells us, "beamed with benevolence," and in whose bosom pulsed,

> "That ecstatic and exulting throb
> Which virtue's votary feels when he sums up
> The thoughts and actions of a well-spent day."

Fancy the pompous self-consciousness of a person who experienced ecstatic and exulting throbs because he had behaved himself for twenty-four hours! Naturally, the heroines had to be of a very superior quality of institution to live up to this sort of thing.

But of a virtue! . . . Witness Clarissa of the iron-bound impeccability, and of a meekness and propriety! . . . of which the heroine of "Sir Charles Grandison" is an example raised to the *n*th power. Poor dear Miss Byron waits patiently through five quarto volumes for her magnificent young man to commit himself—"Sir Charles conducted me to the cedar parlor, where were already my aunt and my grandmamma. He sat down, and,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a manly yet respectful air, his voice gaining strength as he proceeded, thus delivered himself" . . . of six pages before he has done with it, and the ever-admirable Miss Byron had a chance to get in a word edgeways and accept him before he could draw breath to go on!

By the time the early Victorian period was reached, virtue and propriety and colorlessness reigned supreme. The naughty charmer was in exile; but in the mean while, for the first time in the history of literature, women had begun to write about themselves. Miss Burney's Evelina was barely distinguishable from her man-made congeners, but with Miss Austen one began to catch a glimpse of what women thought of themselves and of other members of their sex. It is the quality of genius to be of no period, and Miss Austen's women are as modern and as ancient as are the lovely creations of Shakespeare. Elizabeth Bennet and Miss Emma Woodhouse are the sort of women whom we play bridge with, serve on charitable committees with, and whom our brothers marry—just those good, kind, friendly creatures whom we ask to dinner, and whose discipline of their children we enjoy criticising. So one is hardly justified in judging the woman's heroine in literature by the work of that rare feminine bird, a genius.

George Eliot in her turn broke away from the conventions in "Janet's Repentance," and when she conceived that very modern mid-Victorian young lady, Gwendolen Harleth. Gwendolen was somewhat of a portent, and was so regarded, I remember, when she loomed upon my childish horizon. I remember seeing my elders shake their heads over her vanity and recklessness, her insubordination and her spiritual aspirations—though I think they hardly realized what a prolific parent she was to become of restless, yearning young persons, much concerned as to the state of their souls, and making all their relations desperately uncomfortable with their unbalanced antics. She came upon us at a time which I have since learned to call "the blue-bow period." That is to say that the woman who then reigned in our hearts, and who adorned the short story of our periodical literature, used to straighten out the tangles of her existence by the simple expedient of putting a blue bow into her adorably curling hair. If she found another woman stealing her husband's affections, she calmly checkmated the deadly wiles of the wicked

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

rival by pinning on a blue bow, the effect of this proving so hypnotic that the fascinated male returned at once and permanently to his domestic allegiance. It would cure a husband of drinking habits; it lightened the gloom of financial misfortunes; it even atoned for any little stepping aside from the path of strict wifely duty on her own part. In any stress of circumstance the purchase of a yard of ribbon proved a sort of silken and powerful "God Bless Our Home."

How deliciously simple it would seem if we might straighten out our twentieth-century marital complications by a mere moment at the bargain-counter!

The goddess and the pretty, immoral little hussy were not all forgotten by their male literary adorers; but the "mob of gentlewomen, who wrote with ease," which sprang up, a thick, lettered crop, in the latter half of the nineteenth century, declined to be narrowed down to two sharply contrasting types of the sex, and one began at last to get what Meredith calls "the fine shades" of feminine self-revelation. Some very remarkable shades one has got, it must be confessed. We have had some tingling shocks to our old comfortable prepossessions in the last half-century. As early as the days of the Brontë sisters, the ugly woman had issued a startling declaration of the right of the ill-featured female to emotion and romance. Up to that day none but the beautiful were supposed to move in the enchanted *pays du tendre.* Research fails to show, in all the literature of the male, one really plain heroine. She must be fair or she could not hope to be considered as an applicant for the place. So it was considered immensely piquant when the ugly, passionate little governess from Yorkshire actually pictured another ugly little governess inspiring a passion and posing as a romantic figure. Since then has occurred another revolution made in favor of the *Femme de Trente Ans.* A heroine used to be, in the old days of masculine literary rule, not only beautiful, but, as a necessary concomitant, deliciously young. The blooming chits had it all their own way. The woman of thirty had by that age either made her romantic market or else retired sombrely into the innocuous desuetude of old maidenhood, and served literary needs only as a ridiculous and jealous foil, as a duenna, or as an assistant of the emotional stresses of her younger sister. She passed secret *billets-doux,* or waited to warn while one trembled at a rendezvous by an aged

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oak under the midnight moon. Mrs. Craik, better known to her large clientele as Miss Mulock, was the first to have the courage to suggest that a woman might suffer from romantic emotions after twenty-five without being wholly abnormal, and so far have we progressed beyond the mid-Victorian ideals that that erstwhile youthful dweller in the limelight is now supposed to be meekly at school and not troubling her pigtailed juvenile head about matters fit only for her elders. Even women of forty are allowed to have affairs, and that charming romance known as "The Baby's Grandmother" was received without derision;—it even inspired sympathy.

We are now in the period of the full emancipation of the heroine—an emancipation which she owes largely to her own sex. We have at last a copious body of documents setting forth women's impressions as to woman's real nature, and it would be extremely interesting to take up these documents for careful comparison and examination, and submit them to learned bodies for discussion; to analyze, generalize, philosophize upon them and discover what has been contributed by them to the sum of human truth. Do their self-revelations cast any real light upon the complexities of the soul of that half of the race which men have declared to be capricious and incomprehensible, which they confess in their famous toast to be the unsolvable conundrum—"Woman! We can't make her out, but we'll never give her up."

Two men have written of woman from this modern aspect, but it is safe to say that Hedda Gabler and Candida would never have existed if the Brontës and George Eliot had not broken the ground on which they stand; and yet in the conceptions of both men can be discerned, in new guise, traces of the old alternating male dreams of the female. Hedda Gabler, Nora and the rest are but the old, dominating goddess type subtly modernized and masquerading as contemporary Norwegians, while Candida and her sisters are suspiciously like the present-day versions of the supple, unscrupulous Jade of classic letters.

We must read women's books if we would get new light upon the woman question, if we would study the moral aspect of the matter and consider the soul of the sex from a really new angle of vision. And reading these women's books by the light of our old prejudices, we certainly have the startled sensation that we have heretofore been moving about in a feminine world unreal-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ized; that either those mild brows have been concealing the most astonishing things, or else the woman of our epoch has suffered a sudden change into something new and strange, and that there is no tie of heredity between the mother of yesterday and the daughter of to-day.

Patient Griselda was long held up to us in the era of the masculine domination of letters as a most admirable and to-be-duly-copied person. She was a proof that persistent meek acceptance could overcome at last the tyrannical spirit of her master, but not even one lady of letters urges meekness upon her sisters as a desirable virtue. Quite the contrary. What Henry Arthur Jones calls "that rabble of petticoats" which moves through modern fiction is made up of ladies who have a vivid idea of their own value, and an equally vivid idea of having their own way. If Petruchio were to throw plates about in our time with any idea of subduing the modern Katherine, he would probably find himself promptly ducking to avoid their swift return, or would be haled into court to show cause why he shouldn't pay persistent alimony to salve the wound made upon his better half's feelings by what the divorce-court terms "intolerable cruelty." No; meekness under oppression is not a virtue of the modern heroine.

Unquestioning loyalty to her male was another belauded virtue of the heroine of the past. She followed her male cheerfully to the battlefield, the debtor's prison, or even the scaffold. When a gentleman cheated at cards, drank more than was good for him, flung away his substance in riotous living, or otherwise made things uncomfortable, the virtuous heroine of the past immediately took in plain sewing (she never appeared to be capable of any other kind), changed her residence to a garret, and lived shiveringly on what was known as "crusts"; but she spoke no word of reproach and did the uncomplaining-martyr act in its extremest form of aggravating high-mindedness. The path of the moral transgressor is not smoothed in this fashion in our day. He has domesticated the Recording Angel, and the Critic on the Hearth will condone no moral laxities. Not only must his private conduct square with the rigidest rules of morality, but even in his finances and his politics he must exhibit a standard so lofty as must prove exhausting to even a hero. In a dozen recent tales the hero is called upon to resist the most enticing political and financial temptations at the peril of punishment at the hands of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the heroine, who, whether she be his wife or his sweetheart, demands of her hero a meticulous and subtly perfect conscientiousness; and if he fails to measure up to her exacting level he gets his punishment, infallibly. The famous Nora demands even more, of course. Poor Thorvald has not only to be honest himself, but must be sufficiently high-minded to understand why she shouldn't be; and Candida's husband must be so pure of heart as to condone a flirtation in which he himself would not for one instant be permitted to indulge. It would almost seem as if the old rôles were completely reversed, and it is now the hero who is under obligation to readjust his loyalty to any and all demands made by his exacting heroine. And he gets small sympathy for his efforts. It never occurs to any one to be sentimental over Thorvald, or shed tears of sympathy for Mr. Candida. They are not buoyed up by any comforting sense that the pathetic nature of their sufferings will "make Celia's tender eyes complain," or rouse indignation against the trenchant ladies who have brought their proud masculinity so low. Sweet sixteen will not weep over them, nor chivalrous boyhood burn with indignation at their wrongs.

In a very recent and popular book by a lady novelist, "The Fruit of the Tree," the heroine, a trained nurse, uses her hypodermic needle to shorten the sufferings of a young married woman hurt in an accident, and after the widower marries her he discovers that she shortened the life of his first wife. The nurse feels no compunction for her act, and in fact resents her new husband's qualms about it, and we are made to feel that he is rather a cad to be squeamish over so small a matter, and before long he sees it that way himself, begs pardon and is restored to favor.

It was both interesting and curious to observe the public—particularly the feminine public—attitude at the playing of Maeterlinck's "Monna Vanna," some two years ago. It was the story of the Biblical Judith transformed to a semi-mediæval, semi-modern setting. Monna Vanna was called upon to sacrifice her virtue to save her people; and her husband, very properly it seems to me, objected. He was entirely willing to give his own life, but he was most unwilling to purchase his own or his subjects' lives at a price he held dearer than theirs or his. When she returned from the conqueror's tent, to which she had gone without her husband's knowledge or consent, and announced that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the suddenly generous ruffian had spared her, neither she nor the women in the audience seemed to experience any emotion other than contempt and disgust for the poor maddened husband, who refused to accept her account of the meeting, and no one seemed to feel that his wrongs were in the fact that she had been trying to save him through his own dishonor—that she had not dishonored him being merely an accident, and not through her intention. The general attitude seemed to be that he was making a great fuss about nothing, and behaving in the most tiresome and ridiculous manner.

To come to a still more serious matter, the very keystone of the arch—fidelity of the person and the affections—we find that in this respect also the modern heroine has brought about a complete *bouleversement* of the old order. It used to be conceded that different codes of honor existed for the two sexes. Chastity was the cornerstone of feminine morals; once it was removed the whole fabric fell in ruins. That sound, the building might be flawed, but it was respected. Fibs were but foibles; carelessness in money matters venial. Backbiting, cowardice, narrowness, bigotry were pardonable faults if in matters concerning the other sex one was impeccable. On the other hand, man might have a straying eye and remain a gentleman if no charge of lying, cowardice or dishonesty could be proved. If, however, he cheated at cards, his life among his fellows was as completely at an end as was that of his mate "when lovely woman stooped to folly." How many times has not the tear of sweet sensibility flowed at the sorrows of those poor ladies who, having lost their claim to kindness and respect, wandered in the snow, or crept home to die on the outraged husband's or father's doorstep. No repentance could avail to replace her in the high estate she had forfeited.

> "The only art her guilt to cover,
> To hide her shame from every eye,
> To give repentance to her lover,
> And wring his bosom, is—to die."

The scarlet letter marked her as with the brand of Cain; and, like the male cheater at cards, she must forever wander an exile from the warm precincts of respectability, later heroism not availing to win back the lost regard unless that heroism led to a prompt demise.

The man who cheats at cards still roams an exile, but the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

modern heroine by no means submits to atone her follies by accompanying him. About ten years ago, she arose in her might and declined to accept judgment from a censorious and hypocritic world. "The Superfluous Woman" was one of the first books whose heroine declared her independence of the elder morals She had her little fling, and then asked what we were going to do about it, and we sat with our astonished mouths open and had no answer ready. Grant Allen echoed with "The Woman Who Did,"—and she did very naughty things indeed; and once again we found ourselves out of our depths in the sudden liquefaction of all our old predilections. Since which time the modern heroine has taken the Key of the Fields. The Hester Prynne of to-day would make scarlet letters fashionable, contract an excellent marriage, and shortly be leading mothers' meetings in Mr. Arthur Dimmesdale's popular church; and the very modernest heroine, like the protagonist of "Life's Shop Window," would probably haughtily refuse altogether to be, in the old parlance, "made an honest woman of," and reject marriage entirely as too cramping to her new-found liberty.

Females of the very lightest character may set up as heroines in honorable heroic circles in our tolerant day, and we look forward with prickling interest to see what new forms of moral delinquency these vigorous ladies will next render respectable by their potent patronage.

These fantastic moral excursions are undoubtedly a very natural reaction from a long period of the namby-pambyism of the Rosa Matilda School of the eighteenth century. These are but the sowing of wild literary oats on the part of heady femininity, new to the liberty of the pen, and not yet settled down to the sobered middle age of letters. We are not to take these vagaries too ponderously. It is like the changing voice of the boy, apt to rise into hysteric head notes in the midst of the growth of deeper tones. Liberty is a good thing after all, though it be sometimes abused. The heroine, who is the ideal of the woman herself, the expression of her own highest consciousness of aspiration for herself, will be eventually, no doubt, a very different person from the alternating goddess and rogue; a very different person, too, from the fantastic unclassifiable individual offered us as a model just now. She will clarify into something higher and better than the woman now imagined by women. For the modern heroine

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does not seem to have the elements fitting her to be the mother of heroes, or of heroines either, for that matter.

In the new and intense self-consciousness of women, and of the men dominated by the modern feminism, one of the oldest and most important facts of life is in danger of being obscured. The woman of our day, with only half a century of education, has succeeded in stepping into a new place upon the human stage. She is so new in this place that every eye is turned upon her in the endeavor to analyze and place her in the general scheme of things. But, if she is to be placed apart from the higher idealism, she will have lost something for which all her treasure-trove of liberty and education will be but small compensation. With all the calumny and scorn that men have heaped upon woman, they have yet kept her an ideal. They have treated her much as the Italian fisherman does the image of his patron saint; he smacks it when in a temper, but worships it and looks up to it as something better than himself all the while. Now, an ideal, even when treated pretty roughly, is a potent thing. It assimilates the holder of it to itself, as the green leaf turns a chameleon to its own tint, and all that we do and are, of the best, results from our contact with, our value of, that immediate jewel of our souls. It is said that the capacity for growth and development in a race may always be tested accurately by the race's attitude to its women. If its ideal of women is low and gross, its general progress is also low and gross. And this is equally true of the individual. No one ever knew a really admirable man who thought badly of women, and the nature of a woman is suspect who thinks meanly of her own sex. The terrible welter of European savagery in the Middle Ages got its greatest impetus forward through the development of the dreams of chivalry. And if the real women were at all as the poets and painters and story-tellers thought of them, one doesn't wonder. They were the dearest creatures!

The truth is, the modern heroines do not stir enthusiasm, for the modern heroine on the whole is a pretty bad lot. In this age of investigation, the muck-raker might employ his spare time in exposing her. There is suggestion here of a new direction for a certain well-known person's inexhaustible energy. A fresh interpretation of the Constitution might easily be made to cover her case and bring her under Federal regulation.

ELIZABETH BISLAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NORTHERN QUESTION.

BY BRITANNICUS.

On April 23rd, two Agreements involving seven European Powers and representing their concerted efforts to buttress the political equilibrium of Northern Europe, were signed in St. Petersburg and Berlin. The first pledged Russia, Germany, Sweden and Denmark to the maintenance of the territorial *status quo* in the Baltic. All these Powers border on the Baltic, and three of them possess islands situate in its waters. The new Agreement confirms these possessions by what is virtually a fourfold guarantee. It provides that if the territorial *status quo* in the Baltic regions is threatened by any events whatever, the Governments of the four signatory Powers shall "enter into communication with one another with a view to agreeing upon such measures as they may consider advisable in the interest of the maintenance of the *status quo*." Attached to the Agreement is a Memorandum which reserves to the High Contracting Parties "the free exercise of sovereign rights" in their respective possessions.

The second Agreement is on similar lines, but concerns the North Sea instead of the Baltic. It binds Great Britain, Germany, France, Denmark, Holland and Sweden "to preserve intact and to respect mutually the sovereign rights which these countries now enjoy in their respective territories" in the regions bordering on the North Sea. As in the case of the Baltic Agreement, provision is made for mutual consultation should the territorial *status quo* be threatened by any events whatsoever; a Memorandum is added declaring that the Agreement "can in no way be appealed to whenever there may be a question of the rights of sovereignty of the High Contracting Parties over their respective possessions above mentioned"; and for the purposes of the Agreement the North Sea is defined as "stretching east-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wards as far as its junction with the waters of the Baltic." Simultaneously with these two Agreements, a declaration was signed at Stockholm by Great Britain, France and Sweden denouncing the Treaty of 1855. By this Treaty, Sweden—and in those days Sweden, of course, included Norway as well—pledged herself not to make any cession of territory to Russia; and Great Britain and France undertook, in case of need, to assist her in resisting Russian pretensions or aggressions. The abrogation of this compact can only be construed as a proof that, in the opinion of Great Britain, France and Sweden, the danger it was framed to guard against has been sufficiently obviated by the new Baltic Agreement. Taking the three instruments as a whole they amount to a stringent, solemn and voluntary covenant on the part of the leading Baltic and North Sea Powers to preserve things as they are, and, while retaining their full sovereign rights in their own possessions, to abstain from attacking or encroaching upon one another. No more comprehensive agreement of the kind has been negotiated in our time. It is a contribution on a quite unprecedented scale to the stock of international confidence and good will. It brings France and Germany together in mutual and frictionless co-operation. It assures to the smaller and weaker States that are washed by the Baltic and the North Sea, to Sweden, Denmark and Holland, a guarantee of protection against their more powerful neighbors. I am well aware that "paper compacts" cannot alter inexorable realities, and that no nation can be bound by them at a supreme crisis. But such Agreements as those we are considering have, nevertheless, a real value. They help to soothe apprehensions and banish suspicions, they impose upon the prosecution of aggressive politics moral penalties that no Government in these sensitive days will lightly incur; they definitely and publicly stamp a certain line of conduct with the seal of international approval; they, therefore, make any departure from it peculiarly dishonorable; they rally the pacific sentiments and the public interests of many different peoples to the support of a policy conceived for the benefit of them all; they tend to create that atmosphere of trust and amity in which half the difficulties of diplomacy vanish; and they furnish a foundation and starting-point for further accommodations. Those who minimize the value of such instruments have yet to learn that in international politics concrete issues

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and specific antagonisms are often of less moment than the vaguer but more penetrating influences of distrust, irrational animosity —and continued suspicion.

It will be noticed that Norway is not among the Powers that have signed the Baltic or the North Sea Agreement. The reason is that her position is regarded as being already amply secured. After the rupture of the Union with Sweden, the first care of Norwegian statesmen was to obtain from the Great Powers guarantees for the safety of the new-born kingdom. A Treaty was accordingly negotiated last November placing the integrity of Norwegian territory under the joint guarantee of Great Britain, Russia, Germany and France. The Treaty was little commented upon at the time, yet it was a document of real importance. In the first place, its effect was to supersede the old Treaty of 1855, which bound Great Britain and France to protect the then united kingdom of Sweden and Norway against Russia. In the second place, it was negotiated without consulting Stockholm, and gave great offence to Swedish susceptibilities. It left Sweden for the time being internationally stranded. It placed her at a positive disadvantage as compared with her former partner. Not only was she virtually deprived of the assistance promised by the Treaty of 1855, but she had the mortification of seeing Norway treated with every consideration by the Powers and singled out for their special protection. In the third place, the quadrilateral guarantee of Norwegian integrity is important because it interposes one more barrier between Russia and the warm waters. It is one of the commonplaces of world-politics that Russia, everywhere in sight of the sea, is nowhere in control of it. The Black and Caspian Seas are virtually inland lakes. Ice makes the Baltic unnavigable for a great part of the year, and the passage through it into the North Sea is at the mercy of either Denmark or Sweden. After crossing the expanse of Asia and planting herself at Port Arthur the first outlet to the ice-free waters that she had ever reached—Russia has seen the labor and ambitions of centuries frustrated by the prowess of Japan. Hurled back from the Pacific and debarred from the Persian Gulf, she still remains a landlocked State. In one quarter only has she a chance of escaping the limitations of her fate. Between the Russian outposts in Europe and the freedom of the North-eastern Atlantic there lies nothing more formidable than a few

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miles of Norwegian territory. The possibility of a Port Arthur springing up on the Atlantic is an aspect of the Northern Question too much neglected. The time may come when Russia will find her Treaty obligations to uphold Norwegian integrity a hindrance, or at any rate an embarrassment, in the prosecution of her great secular policy. The time may also come when the identical obligations assumed by Great Britain, France and Germany will be charged with an unlooked-for significance.

That, however, is a problem or a speculation for the future to resolve. Meanwhile, it was clear that the collapse of the partnership between Norway and Sweden, and the protection guaranteed to the former State by four of the Great Powers, left Sweden in a position of some isolation and insecurity. The kind of guarantee that had satisfied the Norwegians would not satisfy her. The Swedes are an easy, aristocratic people, proud of their past, and at one in rejecting as an intolerable humiliation the idea of being placed under the special protection of their more powerful neighbors. At the same time they have been the victims of Muscovite expansion; Finland is a perpetual source of irritation, if not of controversy, between the Russians and themselves; and, as they watch the advance of Russia by land and the growing power of Germany at sea, they feel, not unnaturally, that their independence might well rest on a less precarious footing. It is one of the first advantages of the new Baltic Agreement that, without offending Sweden's dignity and, indeed, by treating her in all ways as on the same level with Russia and Germany, it provides her with all the guarantees of territorial integrity that diplomatic and external assurances can furnish. It is another of its advantages that it has made possible the abrogation of the Treaty of 1855. So long as Great Britain and France were under bonds to lend naval and military assistance to Sweden in resisting Russian aggression, Russo-Swedish relations could not be wholly comfortable. The new arrangement substitutes for the pledge of Anglo-French protection of Swedish integrity a guarantee on the part of Russia, Germany and Denmark that that integrity will be respected. The change seems to me to supply a safeguard much more in conformity with the facts of modern politics, more natural, and more effective.

The position of Denmark throughout these negotiations has been peculiar. She is washed equally by the North Sea and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Baltic, and she controls the passage between them. Germany, it is true, has built the Kiel Canal, and is now widening it at a cost of at least $50,000,000 to accommodate the "Dreadnoughts." But the Kiel Canal is neither the most expeditious nor the most profitable waterway in the world, and practically all the shipping of the Swedish, Russian and German ports in the Baltic passes to the North Sea under Denmark's windows. In the event of a war between, for instance, France and Germany, England and Germany, or England and Russia, the French or British fleet could only gain entrance to the Baltic by steaming through the narrow and difficult straits of the Great Belt or the Sound, both of which may be opened or closed at the will of Denmark, and the seizure of which might, therefore, present itself to Russia or Germany as a strategic necessity. The Danes do not relish the disquieting perils and responsibilities of their situation. At the time of the first Hague Conference 300,000 of his subjects petitioned King Christian to obtain from the Conference a solemn recognition of Danish neutrality. The problems of defence are their constant preoccupation. They have spent a hundred million kroner on safeguarding Copenhagen. They are every day strengthening Seeland's coast-line with forts, mines and torpedoes. They have worked out an elaborate system of transport and mobilization for bringing their troops from Jutland and Fünen to Seeland. The hidden rocks and sand-banks of the Great Belt are far from being its only defences. The Little Belt is only available for the smaller ships, and an enemy trying to force its passage would meet with a warm reception from the shore batteries. The southern entrance to the Sound is already thoroughly protected; the northern entrance will shortly be in almost as good a state; and the capital itself, though vulnerable, has been converted into a great fortified camp.

Altogether, Denmark is incomparably better prepared to resist invasion to-day than at any moment during the nineteenth century. Yet she remains ceaselessly anxious. It is not, in spite of Pan-Germanism, and the unsettled boundary question and the treatment of the Danes in Schleswig, that she expects to be involved in any struggle of her own making. Her dread is that in a war between the Great Powers, and particularly between England and Germany, it will be impossible for her to enforce her neutrality. In the Franco-Prussian war the landing of an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

army in Denmark was an essential, though unrealized, part of the French plan of campaign. Since then the maritime rivalry of Great Britain and Germany has exposed the Danes to new perils. A dash upon the Great Belt by Germany, the seizure of a base by Great Britain, disembarkations upon the coast of Jutland—these are all possibilities, probabilities, or necessities of a situation that might arise. Denmark has sought to escape from them in many ways, by alliances with the Scandinavian Powers, by agitating the question of a British Protectorate, and, as I have just remarked, by endeavoring to extract a guarantee of her neutrality. Self-effacement is her policy, and every project that makes for harmony among the Baltic Powers commands her instant support. There would, therefore, be nothing surprising if history were to confirm the rumor that she was the first Power to suggest the Baltic Agreement. So far as it goes, it is altogether in harmony with her instincts and aspirations. It adds appreciably to her sense of security, and it involves her in no risks or surrenders—unless it be a surrender to acknowledge by implication that Schleswig-Holstein is irrevocably lost.

I have said that, so far as it goes, the Baltic Agreement satisfies Denmark. But how far does it go? It pledges the four Powers that border on the Baltic to respect each other's territorial integrity. That is a great and indisputable gain, but it is far from covering the whole problem of the Baltic, or even its most important part. From the widest international standpoint the question of the Baltic is primarily not a territorial, but a maritime, question. Is the Baltic a *mare liberum* or a *mare clausum?* International law is doubtful on the point, but the policy both of Great Britain and of France has always been to maintain that it is a free and open sea. It was to emphasize that contention that the British Channel Fleet was despatched to the Baltic three years ago for its annual manœuvres. Denmark and Sweden, being relatively weak Powers, and knowing that a recognition of the Baltic as a closed sea would place them in a position of permanent subjection to both Russia and Germany, likewise adopt the British standpoint. The attitude of Germany is not so clear. Mr. Lucien Wolf, the best English authority on the subject, has rightly noted that, in the days of the Great Elector, Prussia consistently championed the freedom of the Baltic against Sweden and Denmark. But since the building of the Kiel Canal, which

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provides Germany with a private entrance and exit of her own, the Pan-Germans have repeatedly agitated for the definite closing of the sea; and although official Germany has hitherto lent them no countenance, it is not impossible that, when the reconstruction of the Canal is complete, the question may be sharply raised, and an attempt made to convert the Baltic into a German, or rather a Russo-German, lake. The risks of such an enterprise are, however, very great, and time is not likely to lessen them materially. In spite of this, the precise status of the Baltic remains a matter of present doubt, and possibly of future danger; and it is felt, especially in England, that diplomacy has missed a chance in not defining it once and for all. So favorable an opportunity may not again occur. The reasons why it was not utilized are probably that diplomatists are a naturally timid race, and live and move under a panic dread of attempting too much; and partly, also, that Germany, as has been hinted, was desirous of excluding Great Britain and France from any share in the Baltic negotiations. So long as the negotiations were limited to the territorial question, the non-Baltic Powers could legitimately be kept from participating in them. Had they been extended to include also the maritime status of the Baltic, it would have been impossible to prevent Great Britain and France from taking a leading part in the discussion.

Another Baltic question, and a far more acute one, which the Agreement fails to cover, is the question of the Aland Islands. It has figured very prominently of late in popular speculations on the scope and purpose of the negotiations. It has sent a shiver of alarm through Sweden; it has been mentioned within the last few months in every Parliament in northern Europe; but whether it was officially raised in the course of the *pourparlers* is not definitely known. I think myself that probably it was not; but I think also that it was more than once obliquely hinted at, and that only the certainty that its discussion would bring the negotiations abruptly to an end prevented it from being made the subject of a formal debate. A glance at the map is enough to make clear the crucial issues involved in it. The Aland Islands lie at the entrance to the Gulf of Bothnia in the Upper Baltic. They consist of one fairly large island and a multitude of islets, rocks and skerries. They used to belong to Sweden, and the twenty-five thousand inhabitants are nearly all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of Swedish origin and still speak the Swedish tongue. Together with Finland, they were ceded to Russia as the result of the war of 1808. Russia proceeded to erect fortifications and to convert the archipelago into a naval base. In the Crimean War, the allied fleets of Great Britain and France destroyed the forts, and, among the provisions of the Treaty of Peace signed in 1856 by Russia, Great Britain and France, it was agreed that for the future the Aland Islands should not be fortified and that no naval or military establishment should be maintained or created upon them. The prohibition has proved of immense international consequence. The Aland Islands might without much difficulty be turned into a well-nigh impregnable naval base. They dominate the Upper Baltic; they protect St. Petersburg; they are situate within three hours' steaming distance of the Stockholm skerries, and within six hours of the Swedish capital itself; and the great bulk of the export trade from the northern provinces of Sweden—timber, pulp, iron ore and iron—has to pass by them. A Russian Kronstadt on the Aland archipelago would, in effect, convert the Upper Baltic into a Russian lake and expose the heart of Sweden to a direct, unescapable and permanent menace. It would secure Russia from the possibility of effective attack in the Baltic, and would thus alter all the political and strategic conditions in her favor. Taken in conjunction with the German base at Kiel, and with the many links of political and dynastic sympathy that unite the Governments of St. Petersburg and Berlin, the fortification of the Aland Islands would invest Russia and Germany with a joint and indisputable predominance over the whole of the Baltic; and one consequence of any such development may very well be that Germany, if involved in war, would feel free to leave the Baltic to the guardianship of Russia and to concentrate all her naval power in the North Sea. It is natural that Russia, especially at a moment when the whole problem of her naval policy is under acute discussion, should wish to be rid of the Treaty of 1856. It is equally natural that Great Britain and France, in their own as much as in Sweden's interests, should insist on maintaining it. The new Baltic Agreement, as I have said, does not specifically touch on the Aland Islands question. Does it, a good many people have been asking, touch on that question by implication? The "sovereign rights" of the High Contracting Par-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ties in their own possessions are definitely and in set terms reserved. Do "sovereign rights" include the right of fortification? May not their reservation be made hereafter the basis of a Russian claim that the Treaty of 1856 has, in effect, been abrogated?

But, in spite of all deductions, the Agreement remains a solid and valuable instrument. If it leaves untouched the two most contentious issues in the range of Baltic politics, it does at least furnish a strong moral guarantee that the apprehensions of the smaller States in regard to their territorial integrity may from now onwards be modified, if not laid aside. I do not anticipate any visible results from this improved sense of security. Norway, it is true, appears to trust so implicitly to her quadrilateral guarantee of neutrality as to contemplate, not precisely disarmament, but at any rate an all-round reduction in her estimates for defence; but it is hardly probable that either Sweden or Denmark will be tempted to follow her example. The advantages gained by these latter States are chiefly to be found in the lowering of the international temperature and in the assurances they have now received in the eyes of the world that certain perils they have feared and guarded against may for the future be disregarded. They accept these assurances with gratitude and relief; they believe them to be of such a nature as to render their infraction for a long while highly improbable; but they are not likely on that account to relax a single precaution.

If now we turn to the North Sea Agreement, we find that the problem it deals with is essentially the same as the Baltic problem, and has been handled in an almost identical fashion. Here, too, we find a number of small and ill-defended States caught between the fire of two perils. One is the peril that they may be absorbed by a single and far more powerful State. The other is the peril that they may be crushed in a collision between any two of their mighty neighbors. In the May number of this REVIEW, "Anglo-American" dealt so fully with the anxieties aroused in Belgium and Holland by the consciousness of their own weakness and by the growth and pressure of Germany and by the many temptations which their geographical position offers to the statesmen of Berlin, that I need not go over this well-worn ground again. The North Sea Agreement amounts practically to a formal repudiation by Germany of the ambitions imputed to her by the Pan-German pamphleteers. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compulsion of permanent facts is not, indeed, mitigated by this disavowal. Holland still bars Germany from the easiest route of access to the North Sea; the mouths of the Rhine still remain in Dutch control; the irksome limitations upon the development of Germany's naval and commercial strength are not less irksome than they were. But the Pan-Germans henceforward are likely to modify their zeal and for a while, at any rate, to draw in their horns. The North Sea Agreement organizes a strong body of international opinion against the aggressions they have hitherto advocated. It has the further good effect of allaying the suspicions that England and Germany have mutually fomented. After these emphatic pledges and disclaimers, it will become morally more difficult for Anglophobes and Teutophobes to persuade their countrymen that England and Germany are each incessantly on the watch to pounce upon the other.

Just as Norway was omitted from the Baltic Agreement, so Belgium is not among the signatories to the North Sea compact; and for very similar reasons. Belgium was permanently mediatized in 1831 under the guarantee of France, Prussia, Austria, Russia and Great Britain. A great deal has happened since then, and it is probable that to-day the most earnest and effective defender of Belgian neutrality is Great Britain. "Antwerp in French hands," said Napoleon, "is a pistol held to England's head." Great Britain has incorporated the maxim among the guiding principles of her foreign policy, and would unquestionably fight sooner than allow Antwerp to pass under either French or German domination. She showed that with sufficient plainness in 1870, and again in 1875, and the past thirty-eight years have only emphasized the necessity of saving the Belgian coasts and ports from being utilized as a base by a first-class naval Power. The danger of any attack upon the independence of Belgium from the French side has, in my judgment, finally passed; while from the German side it is as probable, and no more, as any other of the Pan-German schemes. The true peril that confronts the Belgians is that, in the event of a Franco-German war, their territory may be invaded and their neutrality violated and perhaps permanently destroyed. That contingency all but arose in the war of 1870. In a second struggle between the same Powers, the best military opinion, I believe, inclines to the view that it could not be averted. All Belgium's military

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

preparations are directed towards this sole eventuality. It is possible that in time she may supplement her own efforts by a defensive alliance with Holland. But in the last resort it is upon British power exercised in her behalf for the protection of British interests that her security depends.

Looking at the two Agreements as a whole, it may fairly be said against them that they divide a problem that is essentially indivisible, and to that extent are unsatisfactory. The Baltic Question and the North Sea Question are only parts of the Northern Question, and the mere fact that Denmark fronts on both seas is enough to point the absurdity of treating them separately. Mingling with the satisfaction over the conclusion of the new Agreements is the feeling that they fall some way short, not merely of the ideally best, but of the possible best, and that a more resolute and far-sighted diplomacy might easily have improved upon them. If we admit that the interests of Norway and Belgium are already sufficiently safeguarded and that no diplomatic instrument can add to such security as they at present enjoy, there remain seven Powers intimately concerned in the Northern Question. It is arguable that, had these seven Powers signed a single Convention mutually guaranteeing the territorial *status quo* throughout the regions of the Baltic and the North Sea, the result would have been far preferable to the present arrangement. It would have been preferable, in the first place, because it would have enlisted Great Britain and France in support of Danish and Swedish integrity in the Baltic, and in the second place, because it would have enrolled Russia among the guarantors of Dutch independence in the North Sea. Then, again, in a single and comprehensive Convention it might have proved feasible to incorporate a clause specifically affirming the freedom of the Baltic. As it is, we are forced to be content, as usual, with solutions that are partial and inadequate when they might have been final. Even so, however, the Agreements substantially reinforce the securities of European peace. Besides the anxieties they help to appease and the suspicions they do something towards dissipating, they furnish the very welcome spectacle of France and Germany, and England and Germany, working hand in hand. That co-operation may prove to be more fruitful of results than the Hague Conference itself.

BRITANNICUS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

POSTAL SAVINGS-BANKS.

BY GEORGE V. L. MEYER, POSTMASTER-GENERAL.

To encourage thrift in the wage-earner and person of small means, by affording a place for the deposit of the dime that otherwise "burns a hole in the pocket," is the prime object of postal savings-banks. The post-office is open early and late, and the day-laborer returning home on Saturday night with his week's pay finds the regular banks closed, but the saloon open. The post-office bank would attract some of his earnings and of the earnings of the other classes now accustomed to go to Uncle Sam's office for their stamps and letters, where they are received and treated cordially without discrimination. It is estimated that, within a few years, about $500,000,000 would be deposited in this way; and, under the scheme which I have recommended to Congress, the money would be placed in the channels of trade through the instrumentality of the national banks.

Postal savings-banks are now in operation in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, Austria, Belgium, Canada, France, Hungary, India, Italy, the Netherlands, New South Wales, New Zealand, the Philippines, Queensland, Russia, South Australia, Sweden, Victoria, Japan, and the British, Dutch and French colonies. In Germany, the municipal savings-banks are under the jurisdiction of the Government and they are also considering the need of postal savings-banks.

Their establishment in the United States has been discussed since 1871; but their desirability and peculiar efficacy in averting financial panics was not appreciated by the business world generally until last fall, at which time the money received through the postal banks would have strengthened many institutions, for, as fast as withdrawals were made from the banks

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and placed in the postal banks for safe-keeping, it would have been returned to the banks through the agency of the national banks. I advocated their creation as far back as last August.

In certain parts of our country, savings institutions are sufficiently numerous to accommodate the people, but such areas are quite limited, being confined to New England, New York and a few other States. It is alleged that, by reason of the number and location of savings-banks, there is a savings account to every two of the population of New England; while, in all the country outside New England and New York, the average is only one savings account to every 157 of the population. As the people of all sections of this country are pretty much the same in habits, inclinations and purposes, it must be obvious to the most casual observer that the people of the South, the Middle West and the West do not save their earnings as do those of New England from the lack of opportunity—that is, from the mere want of secure places in which deposit may be made.

The total amount of deposits in the savings-banks of this country is $3,690,078,945. Of this amount, $1,394,296,034 is in the State of New York; $1,229,701,214 is in the New England States, $694,081,142 being deposited in the State of Massachusetts; $282,508,956 is in the State of California; $159,174,012 is in the State of Pennsylvania; $194,668,858 is in the State of Illinois; $135,370,436 is in the State of Iowa, and but $294,359,435 in the rest of the United States.

From these figures it will be seen that 38 per cent. is in New York State; 33 per cent. is in the New England States, about 19 per cent. being in Massachusetts; about 8 per cent. in California; 4 per cent. in Pennsylvania; 5 per cent. in Illinois; nearly 4 per cent. in Iowa, and about 8 per cent. in all the remaining States.

It has been computed that, in the New England States, the post-office averages only about fifteen miles from the savings-bank, the distance in the Middle States being twenty-five miles, in the Southern States thirty-three miles, and in the States west of the Rockies fifty-five miles.

To those who fear that these postal banks or depositories will invade the domain of savings-banks or commercial banks, experience in other countries should be sufficient assurance to the contrary. If, as in England, the law should provide for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merging of postal deposits in Government bonds and the use of all postal funds by the Government, it might follow that a great and needless concentration of money in the Government vaults might occur; but, under the terms of the bill before Congress, such concentration cannot occur. On the contrary, the inevitable tendency must be to keep all of the available money of the country in active circulation in the localities where it is brought to the post-office. Undoubtedly, there are millions of dollars withheld from banks and placed in hiding because of lack of confidence in the banks, or else because the amount in hand is considered too trifling and small to bring to a bank.

Instead of injuring present financial institutions, it would be of great benefit to them and would strengthen their position. Any depositor who at present has dealings with a savings-bank and is getting four per cent. interest would not take his deposit away, and thereby reduce his income one-half by placing it in the post-office. The individual who opens an account with a National or State bank or trust company has the advantage of a check-book, enabling him to pay his bills in a convenient manner, and to have his paper and that of his customers or clients discounted. None of these advantages would accrue to a depositor in the postal savings-bank. Again, when the depositor had accumulated money to the amount of two hundred or three hundred dollars, he would in all probability withdraw it and place it in a savings-bank, where he could obtain much larger returns. Furthermore, in times of nervous fright it would be a benefit to banking institutions (should the depositor place it with the postal savings-bank instead of withdrawing it for the purpose of putting it in hiding), as it would be deposited immediately with the local national bank, thus strengthening that institution and the community.

More than seven million immigrants landed in this country during the past ten years, and it has been demonstrated that in the aggregate immense sums of money have been hoarded or sent away by these people. In many instances, it has been found that, for want of postal savings-banks, money orders are being bought, payable to the purchaser, which are good for one year. There can be no question as to the advisability of encouraging the foreigners within our borders to make such disposition of their savings as will result in a benefit to the communities in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which they are employed. Most of these people come from countries in which postal savings-banks have been long established, and they have little confidence in any depository for savings which is not absolutely vouched for by the Government. In the year ended January 1st, 1908, money orders amounting to $94,892,716 left this country to replenish foreign coffers; and, in addition, many millions were undoubtedly sent through the agency of banks and express companies. Of course, not all of this money was sent by our foreign population, but the greater part of it certainly represented their savings. In fact, it has been brought to my attention that money of the immigrants, on account of its possessors being ignorant of our language and suspicious of our private institutions, is being sent home that it may be placed in the postal savings-banks of their native countries.

To show just what these foreigners are doing, I quote the following from a report of a post-office inspector:

"One week ago, an Italian went to East Liberty Station (Pittsburg) and made out applications for ten money orders of $100 each. He shoved the applications, $1,000, and fees through the window and started away. The clerk called to him to come back and get the orders. His answer was that he hadn't time to wait, but would call for the orders later. His faith in the Government was such that he left his thousand dollars without a receipt of any kind. On Tuesday, a foreigner at the main office here arranged to buy $1,000 worth of money orders. These orders cost him three dollars. He said he was afraid of banks and a safe deposit box would cost him five dollars a year. He could hold these orders for a year, and then cash them, saving two dollars, or he could hold them for seven years. After the first year, payment is made only on a Department warrant, which takes time. This morning, a man at Arsenal Station bought $400 worth of orders, which he said he intended to hold for a year."

The foreign settler should be induced to deposit his earnings in this country, because, after he had accumulated a few hundred dollars, he would not be content to receive merely two per cent. interest, but would either place it in a savings-bank at four per cent., or possibly seek to purchase a home; and, the moment he acquired real property here, he would become a more conservative citizen, would be actively interested in the affairs of the nation, and at the same time would place himself and his dependents beyond the likelihood of becoming public charges. Should his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

earnings remain in the postal savings-banks, however, the fact that he had an interest in the Government and something at stake would tend to make him a more desirable citizen.

Under the bill now before Congress, the Postmaster-General is given authority to designate all money-order post-offices (about forty thousand in number) to receive deposits of money for savings.

Accounts may be opened by any person of the age of ten years, and a married woman may open an account free from interference by her husband. A trustee may open an account for another person. No person can open more than one savings account except when acting as trustee for another individual.

A depositor's pass-book will be delivered to each depositor in which the name and other memoranda for identification will be entered, and entry of all deposits shall be made.

One dollar or a larger amount in multiples of ten cents will be necessary to open an account, but deposits of ten cents or multiples thereof will be received after an account is opened.

Upon receiving a deposit, the postmaster is required to enter the same in the pass-book of the depositor and immediately notify the Postmaster-General of the amount of the deposit and the name of the depositor. The Postmaster-General, upon receipt of such notice, is required to send an acknowledgment thereof to the depositor, which acknowledgment shall constitute conclusive evidence of the making of such deposit and serve as a check on the postmaster receiving the deposit.

Interest is allowed at the rate of two per cent. *per annum*, computed annually on the average deposit during each quarter of the year. One thousand dollars is the maximum deposit allowed to the credit of any one person; more than two hundred dollars cannot be deposited in any one month, but interest will not be paid on any amount to the credit of an account in excess of five hundred dollars.

Postal savings-bank funds are to be deposited by the Postmaster-General in national banks located as near as may be in the neighborhood where such deposits are received, at a rate of interest not less than two and a quarter per cent. *per annum*. If deposits cannot be made in national banks at the specified rate of interest, which is not anticipated, the Postmaster-General may, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury and the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Attorney-General, invest in State, Territorial, county or municipal bonds. As the Post Office Department is a preferred creditor, it will not demand collateral from the banks in the way of bonds, on deposits which do not exceed the capital of the national bank.

I confidently believe that a postal savings-bank law will be enacted at the next session of Congress, and I have had assurances from more than a majority of the Senators that they will support the measure. The bill has been set for debate beginning on December 14th, and Senator Carter, who has charge of the measure, has every belief that it will pass. It was unanimously reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads. The Republican National Convention has just declared in its favor in the Party Platform. The Post Office Department looks for speedy action on the part of the House, because the people are demanding it, as they have a right to do, and as the proposition is better understood opposition ceases.

I desire to repeat that, while postal banks are primarily in the interest of the wage-earner, they will also be mutually beneficial to labor and capital, and prevent the hoarding of money throughout the country.

GEORGE V. L. MEYER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME UNPALATABLE SUGGESTIONS.

BY W. D. HOWELLS.

"A THOUSAND expressions," says Heine, "have the Arabs for the horse, the French for love, the Germans for beer, and the English for hanging." Nothing seems to have appealed so vividly to the fancy of our forefathers from the time when a thief could be hanged for stealing the value of a shilling down to the time when our forefathers became our elder brothers, and people could be hanged only for a very few crimes besides murder. When they could be hanged for nothing but murder, the merry conception of hanging still remained, and the fond associations which clustered about the gallows-tree attested the tenderness of our race for the old ideal. Our race is otherwise tough, and its sensibilities are of a leathery consistence which does not readily yield to reason or emotion. This is supposed to be something fine, and to keep us the superiors of the races apt to be carried away by logic or pity. At the period when not only forgers and housebreakers and footpads, but petty larceners were hanged as well as murderers, a man so quite typically good as Doctor Johnson habitually spoke of the popular punishment with complacency, and often with cheerfulness close upon hilarity. He might compassionate certain offenders, and it is well known how hard he tried to move the King to mercy for a clergyman who had imitated the signature of the Earl of Chesterfield; but that all such offenders were justly punished by death he had apparently no doubt. Commoner people were touched in like manner by particular cases, such as that of several persons who were found guilty of stealing some handkerchiefs worth a shilling, but whose lives were saved by the kind-hearted shopkeeper's swearing that the handkerchiefs were worth only ninepence. The convicts were then merely transported for fourteen years,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and one of them lived to write a very agreeable autobiography; but the rule was that thieves were hanged, and rightly, almost blithely. The literature of the time abounds in proofs of the humorous gayety with which Englishmen regarded the favorite expiation. "The Beggar's Opera" is full of such felicities, and that famous masterpiece doubtless contributed many witty expressions to the thousand with which the imagination of our race has caressed it.

There has always and everywhere been a tendency to euphemize the names of punishments, which has probably come from the superexcited humorous sense of the sufferers, or from the intellectual leisure which abounds in the lives of prisoners, and of criminals who are not yet, or yet again, prisoners. Sometimes it seems to come from a wish for scientific precision and succinctness in the lawmakers. A graphic instance is the verb "exoculate," which was created in the necessity of briefly describing the process of putting out the eyes of offenders condemned to lose their sight. Exoculation in the Eastern Empire was largely applied to the next of kin in the case of political evil-doers sentenced to death; but the traveller Vambery saw it, not a generation ago, inflicted upon eight or ten respectable business men in Persia; his description of it is rather terrible. "Decollation" is a polite Latinism for cutting off heads; and there seems an instinctive endeavor for some term in like cases which shall either mask or burlesque the fact. Ever since the introduction of State-homicide by electricity, we have ourselves been seeking a word which should say it comprehensively and inoffensively. We have got no further than "electrocution," a mongrel vocable as hateful to the philological sense as "automobile"; it should be either wholly a Greek derivative or a Latin; "the mixture of the two" is, as Browning says, "a marvel and a curse." But we lack still more a polite or a jocose euphemism for the penalty which the State, in the spirit of Oriental jurisprudence, visits upon the family of a man sentenced to a term in prison. I do not mean the infamy; society in its less organized form looks after that; but I mean the total deprivation of the criminal's family of the support, such as it was, which it received from him. "Pauperization" would do, but it seems a weak word, and it has been used so often in warning people not to give alms, that the sharper primitive sense is worn off it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We require still some locution which shall fully express the fact, and yet shall travesty or soften it so that it shall either amuse us or reconcile us to it through an elegant exactness of epithet. Possibly the convicts themselves have a phrase for it; but, as it is, the fact is not even roughly realized by the public at large, as it might be if sentences were run to some such effect as that John Doe, or Mary Doe, should be imprisoned in the penitentiary for five or ten or fifteen years, and that, in the mean time, his or her children, or dependent father, mother, brothers or sisters should be denied his or her earnings, which the State should seize and retain as an added punishment.

Sometimes, in visiting Courts of Justice, as they are called, it has seemed to me that all sentences were still too severe. I have, for instance, found it monstrous that for a very trifling theft, which would indeed once have hanged a man or a boy, the culprit should be sent up, or sent over, as the direction of the prison chanced to be, for say three months. As for a sentence of ten or fifteen years one must feel that it should never be passed for anything but for the most heinous offence; and I hold now that any added punishment, any accumulated misery, is atrocious, especially if it falls upon the convict's family, as it chiefly must when the State confiscates the prisoner's earnings. Even when he has no family, it is hardly less abominable to withhold his wages, for when he comes out of prison at the end of his time, he comes out an exasperated beggar, whom, if he is known to have been a felon, no one will willingly employ and very few befriend. Wretches like that have then nothing before them but crime, and they commit new crimes because they must; they go back to prison, and so continue on in a vicious circle to the end. They swarm by hundreds of thousands all over the land, in and out of jail, and their lot seems without hope unless there is some hope for them in such a scheme as a recent observer has suggested. One cannot seriously consider the proposition of the United States Attorney-General that they shall be put to death after a certain number of repetitions of their offences against society, though that suggestion is something which should give him much serious thought hereafter. But a writer in a recent number of a sociological journal proposes, rather less impossibly, the establishment of a "Court of Rehabilitation," as he calls it. This Court shall inquire into the conduct of the pris-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oners, whose sentences shall all have been made indeterminate, and whose imprisonment shall end when the fact of their genuine repentance is convincingly ascertained. A verdict of the Court of Rehabilitation in their favor shall be the warrant to society that they are fit to enter upon some honest employment, and may be safely trusted with life and property when they are liberated. I need not follow the reasoning by which the writer seeks to persuade us that the inquiries of such a court are practicable, and that its finding may be confidently accepted. What is self-evident is that it would be infinitely better than nothing, and that the criminals whom it rehabilitated would be incomparably usefuller men than those whom a determinate sentence now frees to prey upon society.

Indeterminate sentences we already have, but there is nothing to certify formally to the public that the prisoner who comes out sooner is a fitter man to resume his economic and social place than the prisoner who comes out later. He has the stigma upon him, and his fellow men are not invited to trust him as they would be if a verdict of the Court of Rehabilitation declared him, by every reasonable test, a penitent man. The writer who urges the establishment of such a tribunal bases his argument in its favor on the strong belief that when a prisoner has no hope of escape but through reform he will accept the conditions, and in mere self-interest make the effort to be henceforward an honest man, with those helps to his reform which assiduous moral and intellectual training in prison will have supplied him. This is taking him on a very low plane, but the plane is not lower than that on which we all, who have somehow kept out of jail, try, from time to time, to rebuild our characters; and by a very little effort we can sympathize with a reformer who asks our sympathy on the level of our average human nature.

But we have to do here only with his incidental suggestion (which I will own has reminded me of the neglected purpose of the present essay) that the criminal shall be paid fair wages by the State during his imprisonment, and that when he is released he shall be given his earnings to live upon until he can find something to do. This part of the scheme is not so novel as the whole scheme, and it seems more immediately practicable. It has been more than once proposed in different States: only winter before last, a bill to enact it was, I believe, introduced into the Ohio

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

legislature, where it probably met the accustomed fate of such bills at the hands of the economists who look to it that the State, or at least the contractors, shall profit by the unpaid labor of convicts. Such economists have perpetuated with us those ideals of Oriental jurisprudence by which the innocent are made to suffer as much as possible with the guilty; and they insist that, when a criminal is sent to prison, his family shall be left to starve, while the State sets him a thief's example by stealing his wages. It is true that the State is supposed to sin against him in the interests of society; but it is possible that, upon closer study, it might be found that the interests of society could be better served by the State's paying currently to the criminal's family—his worse than widow, his worse than orphans—his earnings at a rate based upon the Trades Unions' scale of wages; or, if he has no such dependents, by giving them to the criminal himself when he leaves its custody. This might at least dispose of the grievance which the Unions have sometimes had with the State about prison cheap labor. As it is, convicts are taught trades, but organized labor protests against their exercise of their trades in prison; and, when they return to the world, they remain beggars till they can again become criminals. But, if they were given full wages in prison, they would, after paying the State all that their board, lodging and clothing were worth, still have money enough to live on till they could approve themselves worthy of honest work.

This is the business view of the matter; if we regard it from a higher point, I hope my readers will agree that the State might well pay the convict his hire merely because it is just to do so. At any rate, I venture the conjecture; and, while I am about it, I have another observation to make. We are all, in and out of jail, doing a great deal more for the State than it does for us, severally or collectively, and we ought to try, as a matter of duty toward one another, to make the State do its part; we ought to educate the State in its duties to the citizen. In a war of invasion, the State may draft us into its service and imperil our lives and limbs for an office-boy's wages; or, in any war, it may invite us to volunteer, with the promise of half or quarter pay in the form of a pension much begrudged us by patriots not drafted, or not volunteering. Even in time of peace, the State levies taxes, and imposes tasks upon us for which it makes no adequate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

return. It obliges us to serve on juries for two dollars a day, while our proper incomes languish and our affairs fall into disorder. It maintains costly administrations which will not mend or clean our streets, and constabularies against which we have no recourse when they fail to protect our lives or limbs. If a burglar breaks into our houses, the city, which makes us pay its police for our protection, does not make good our losses; if trains, or trolleys, or motors maim us, the State does not pay us, but ironically allows us to bring suit for damages. If any wrong can be made to lie against the State, the State will right it only upon some such long delay and final compulsion as none but the most thrifty and frugal lover of his country could have the heart to inflict upon the injured.

The State is still, after individual despots have been largely modified or eliminated, a collective despot, mostly inexorable, almost irresponsible, and entirely inaccessible to those personal appeals which have sometimes moved the obsolete or obsolescent tyrants to pity. In its selfishness and meanness, it is largely the legislated and organized ideal of the lowest and stupidest of its citizens, whose daily life is nearest the level of barbarism. Justice must be extorted from it: a rogue may readily enrich himself in its service, but an honest man shall spend his life in a vain effort to get his due. Such facts incline us naturally to question any proposition which seems to affect the nature of the State. If the State has always stolen the wages of its prisoners, it seems to our patriotism a very good reason why it should always do so. If it has left for every, or for every other, convict whom it robs of his earnings a helpless family to suffer for want of his support, its practice is sufficient proof of its right to punish the innocent with the guilty. If it turns the destitute convict loose at the end of his sentence more depraved than at the beginning, and practically doomed to incur another imprisonment, there must be something in the nature of things which justifies the State in a cruelty apparently so monstrous.

Still, it is not impossible that the State should be something different. Even that lowest and stupidest citizen whose ideals the State so largely embodies is human. Such a citizen may wake in the dawn of some brighter day and perceive by the unwonted light that it is not well to compel a man to the repetition of crime when there is a chance of saving the community from his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

renewed depredations. "Of course," the lowest and stupidest citizen will reason, "there must be something right in the present custom, just as there was formerly something right in hanging a man for the theft of a shilling; but perhaps it had better be looked into. The actual arrangement seems to be expensive."

When the lowest and stupidest citizen—who may be occupying a very high place socially, politically and financially—comes to this reasoning, it may occur to him that there is a feature of our criminal procedure which may affect him, though hitherto he has escaped. In this luminous moment it may appear to him rather droll that a citizen, not even the lowest and stupidest, may be arrested on a charge of which the genius of our law holds him innocent until he is proved guilty, and may be kept in jail till it is convenient for the State to try him, while all the sagacity of the police and all the ingenuity of the prosecution are employed in extorting and accumulating and contriving proofs of his guilt. When he is brought to trial, his torment is protracted through weeks or months, while the prosecution and the defence fight over him for his life. After the examination of the witnesses and the testimony of experts and squabble of counsel, the State will claim the last word in the summing up, speaking twice where the defence may speak but once, and outraging a yet innocent man by every conceivable defamation, by impassioned appeals to the prejudices of the jurymen, by flattery of their passions, by every insinuation from the testimony in which there is perhaps no direct proof whatever against him. All the vulgar and shabby arts of rhetoric may be employed to sway the weary minds of the twelve men forced from their proper affairs at two dollars a day, to decide whether he is guilty or not. The judge then charges them, wisely or unwisely, but unquestionably from his preoccupations concerning the matter, and they find the accused guilty or not guilty. If they find him guilty, he is sent to the death chamber to await his turn in the electric chair. His counsel may now contrive to stay execution of his sentence by this device and that, for weeks, months and years. Then, if he is brought to trial again, he may be declared innocent, as innocent while he rested in the shadow of death as ever he was, or as any of us is.

But what reparation does the State make him for his time, of which it has wasted years, and for the agony which it has in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

flicted upon an innocent man? Does it compute his wrong in money, and offer to recompense him for his loss and pain? Does it formally claim the sovereign right, the sacred privilege, of paying his counsel, the men who have saved him from its error, and kept from its annals the stain of his guiltless death? Does it declare, with forms of peculiar solemnity, in some special session of its highest tribunal, that he has been deeply wronged and that now he must be righted in the esteem of all just men? Nothing of the kind. It simply lets him go, under the cloud that it does nothing else to lift from him, and leaves him to pay the whole cost of his fight for life. Sometimes there is popular applause at the acquittal of an accused man, and then an officer commands silence in the court. But ought there to be silence in the court? Would not the court's dignity be more respected by a joyful noise, which should echo through all the land, proclaiming the escape of the State from the commission of a disgraceful blunder? As yet, the courts think not; but the circumstances may yet affect even the sort of citizen we have been imagining as grotesque. Such a citizen may say, to be sure, that we are not different from the rest of the civilized world in these features of our criminal procedure, and he can justly hold that nowhere is an accused person indemnified for his losses through the blundering of the State. He can say, and probably will continue to say, that it is enough for the accused to have got off. But is it?

W. D. Howells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEW IRELAND—VI.

THE GAELIC LEAGUE.

BY SYDNEY BROOKS.

I HAVE already expressed and reiterated my opinion that the essence of "the new Ireland" is the determination of the Irish people to build up an Irish character and an Irish individuality in an Irish atmosphere. It is a determination that manifests itself in many ways, politically in the Sinn Féin movement, economically in the industrial revival and in the reorganization of agriculture on a cooperative basis, spiritually and linguistically in the Gaelic League. Of all these energizing forces the Gaelic League, from more than one standpoint, appeals to me as the most interesting and the most fundamental. Ireland to-day, as ever, is the joyous hunting-ground of the political quack. One man will tell you that all she needs is Home Rule; another, that a truce to agitation and the unflinching maintenance of law and order are her only desiderata; a third puts the nationalization of the railways in the forefront of his programme of regeneration; a fourth stakes everything on the reclamation of the peat bogs and their conversion into sources of industrial motive-power; a fifth declares that there can be no hope for Ireland until the people have broken loose from clerical leading strings. I do not quarrel with any of these specifics; Ireland, quite conceivably, may need them all. But I cannot persuade myself that, either individually or collectively, they quite reach the heart of the Irish problem. The deepest and most permanent questions involved in that problem, as I see it, are questions not of constitutional change or adaptation, not primarily of material development or of mental emancipation, but of character and of spirit—questions not of Ireland, but of Irish men and women. I am inclined, therefore,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to hold that Dr. Douglas Hyde, the Irish Mistral, the founder of the Gaelic League and its President, came nearer the truth when he proclaimed that Ireland was ceasing to be Irish, and could only realize her true self by becoming Irish once more.

That the Irish are not Irish is no paradox. I do not, of course, mean to imply that in travelling through the country as an uninitiated Englishman I was not made conscious of something foreign in the atmosphere, and of a mode of life and a cast of thought and temperament that, whatever else they might be, were certainly not English. But, on the whole, nothing more surprised me than to note how far the process of Anglicization had spread. The Irish claim to be a nation, but they are remarkably destitute of the distinctive signs of a separate people. An average Londoner might well be puzzled to decide in what particulars or to what degree the Irish impressed him as being more alien than the men of rural Yorkshire or Cornwall. They would strike him as being English provincials with a difference —a difference that was far from amounting to the virtue of a genuine nationality. He would observe, of course, certain local idiosyncrasies of speech and manners; but their effect would be easily outweighed by the evidence that would confront him on every side of the completeness of English domination; and, if he stopped to think about the matter at all, he would probably conclude that a people reading, speaking and writing practically nothing but English, wearing English dress, playing English games, singing English music-hall songs, copying English ways, and largely governed by English social conventions, had forfeited their right to be considered a separate nation. And it is, I think, unquestionably the fact that the nineteenth century crushed out of the Irish people nearly all the characteristics that made them a distinctive entity. It found them Irish; it left them imitation English. It destroyed their language, their pastimes, their music, their special social atmosphere. One by one, the links that bound them to their past were snapped. One by one, the emblems of their separateness disappeared. A hundred years ago, Irish was spoken up to the gates of Dublin. It has now dropped to be a mere fugitive tongue of the outskirts. When the Gaelic League sprang to its rescue, some fourteen years ago, there were only some 38,000 people who spoke Irish and nothing else, and less than one-seventh of the total population even understood it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is a Dutch proverb which says, "No language, no nation." In that abrupt form the dictum will hardly bear a moment's historical analysis. But it is, I think, a safe assertion that a common speech spreads its roots far down in the complex psychology of nationhood; and it is not less certain that a nation cannot, as the Irish have done, lose its ancestral tongue without losing at the same time a good deal more. A people who allow their native speech to sink into disuse or to linger only in remote seaboard places, and who become habituated to an alien tongue, insensibly but inevitably find that they have parted with nearly all that makes them an individual nationality, that for them the past loses its meaning and its message, and that their minds, their manners, their ideals, the whole bent of their civilization, are marked with an alien stamp. And this to a very great extent is what has happened to the Irish. The nineteenth century, by killing their language, killed the very soul of the people. It cut them off from their past and from everything that made them a separate organism. It obliterated, where it did not uproot, their traditions, deflected their instinctive habits of thought, and sought to amalgamate them with a foreign, overpowering, but essentially repugnant, civilization. "To all but the wilfully blind or the hopelessly thoughtless and unobservant," said a distinguished Irishman nine years ago, "it is painfully evident that we are fast losing our national identity, our national distinctiveness, our racial characteristics. . . . National customs, traits and ideals are disappearing fast. We are densely, abysmally ignorant of our history, and not of our history merely, but of everything appertaining to our past—of our laws, our customs, our polity, our social system, our literature, our folk-lore, and of the language which enshrines them all and which alone can adequately and securely perpetuate them. Of all these things we, as a nation, know little or nothing, and seem to care less. The iron has entered our souls. We palm ourselves on our patriotism and nationalism, whereas in many vital respects we have become almost completely Anglicized." That is true and frank —frank, I mean, because it places the responsibility where it belongs. The Irish have a rather charming way of never admitting that they are to blame for anything. They are the most stubbornly self-exculpatory of peoples. For whatever is amiss in their social or political or economic conditions, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fault is always England's, never their own. Characteristically enough, they have tried to cast upon the broad British doorstep the responsibility for the decay of Gaelic. They trace its decline to the imposition in the 'thirties of an English-made educational system that penalized, where it did not ignore, the native tongue. I have not the least intention of defending that system. The idea of those who devised it seemed to be that to educate the Irish you had first to wring everything that was distinctively Irish out of them. The children grew up impartially ignorant of both English and Irish, knowing nothing of their national past, of who or what they were. The thread of historical continuity came, as it were, to a sudden end in these denationalized outcasts, cut off from their own civilization and unable to assimilate another's.

But it is impossible to stamp out a language which the people are determined to keep alive. It was not England that murdered Irish civilization; it was Irish civilization that committed suicide. Had the Irish shown one-tenth of the earnestness in preserving their ancestral tongue that they showed in preserving their ancestral religion, Ireland would to-day be a bilingual country. The truth is that the people welcomed, and joined in hastening, the decline of Gaelic. Parents hung a tally, a small block of wood, around the necks of their children, and a notch was made on it for every word of Irish they were heard to speak; and the schoolmaster counted the notches and dealt with the pupils accordingly. The priesthood did more than any other body of Irishmen towards killing the national language. The Protestants had started a proselytizing movement among the Irish-speaking peasants. Tracts and pamphlets written in Irish, Bible-readers and missionaries familiar with the vernacular, spread all over the south and west. The Catholics met the attack by banning the Irish language, frowning even upon its domestic use, and procuring the destruction, wherever possible, of Gaelic books and manuscripts. It ceased to be the language of the pulpit, of education, of catechism, of the liturgies, of the fair and, finally, of the fireside. Then came O'Connell and the famine. O'Connell, by far the most powerful Irishman of the last century, knew Irish from his childhood, and, had he chosen, could have established it as the settled language of the people. But he had no conception either of how its use would fortify or its

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oblivion disintegrate the spirit of Irish nationality. He did worse than nothing for it. Thousands probably learned English simply that they might be able to follow his speeches. He never, I believe, made a public speech in Irish; never attempted in any way to stay its decline or to foster its revival. On the contrary, he boycotted and suppressed it; and what little the weight of his influence failed to overthrow, the vast exodus of Irish-speaking peasants after the famine came to crush. No speech could well have fallen lower. Despised, trampled upon, disowned, it fell in sixty-odd years from the language of a literature into little more than a mere dialect of the barren and backward west. And with it the true fibre of Irish nationhood began to rot away—the traditions, the habits of thought, the pride and consciousness of the past, all that makes a virile and distinctive people. The very idea of nationality, in anything but its narrowest political sense, seems to have perished. The people are appallingly ignorant of their own past, except in so far as it discredits England. Of all that there is in it that should be the glory of every Irishman they know next to nothing. They have drifted all unconsciously into the position of racial nondescripts. They can never, of course, become wholly Saxon; they can never cease to retain something of the Celt; but they stood, fifteen years ago, an awful chance of developing into a colorless hybrid, half provincial English, half renegade and emasculated Irish.

It was this threatened bankruptcy of a civilization that the Gaelic League was formed to avert. It set out to recover for Ireland her lost language, her authentic culture. Its founders were moved by the same impulse of national regeneration that has thrilled in turn Poland and Hungary, Bohemia and Finland. No ideal less splendid could have sustained them through the initial years of hopelessness. They were determined to arouse and appeal to a higher and all-embracing nationality. Creeds, parties, sections, races, interests, all the rigid lines of Irish division and subdivision, they absolutely disregarded. They made their League from the start non-political and non-sectarian. Men of little fame or influence and with even less money, they suddenly called upon all Irishmen to devote themselves—I quote from the Constitution of the League—to the "preservation of Irish as the national language of Ireland and the extension of its use as a spoken tongue." For a long while the response to their

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

appeal was slow, timid and fitful. But, looking back on their fourteen years of labor, they may fairly pride themselves on a phenomenal success. The Gaelic League to-day boasts of an enrolled membership of one hundred thousand, with more than nine hundred branches throughout the country. It maintains fourteen regular organizers and eighty travelling teachers. It has founded six training colleges for the education of instructors in Gaelic. It claims to have forced the teaching of Irish into three thousand schools. It has secured from the Board of National Education an acknowledgment of the right of every Irish child in every national school to be taught Irish as an ordinary subject. In districts that are wholly or partly Irish-speaking, it has succeeded in introducing an official bilingual programme of instruction. It has made a knowledge of Gaelic essential to candidates for a large number of public offices. At this moment, there are probably not less than a quarter of a million of Irish people, children and adults, learning Irish. The Gaelic League is one of the largest and most successful publishing firms in the country. It organizes festivals and summer schools; it prints a weekly and a monthly journal; it holds public contests and distributes prizes. One meets its influence everywhere. You can hardly go into an Irish town without finding one or two names written in Gaelic over the doors of the shops. You can hardly pick up an Irish paper without finding a column at least printed in Gaelic. In Dublin the names of the streets appear both in English and in Irish. Bank managers who refuse to cash checks signed in Gaelic, railway managers who see no reason why they should go to the expense of having the names of their stations placarded in Gaelic, find themselves enthusiastically denounced from one end of the country to the other.

Nor is it only with the language that the Gaelic League concerns itself. Music, oratory, singing, dancing and the revival of the old Gaelic games all come within its scope. It is the only really national university that Ireland possesses, and its splendid success means that education in Ireland is to become permeated with Irish ideas and brought into touch with the historic genius of the people, and that Ireland is to be made once more an interesting country for Irishmen to live in. But even that is far from telling the whole story. You cannot revive a dying tongue without first touching the secret chord of national patriotism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Gaelic is not an easy language and the average indolent Irishman will not rouse himself to grapple with its difficulties unless it is presented to him in the light of a high duty, unless he is passionately convinced that, so long as he is ignorant of Irish, he does not deserve to be called an Irishman. But when that point of exaltation is reached, many consequences follow that seem, at first sight, to have little or nothing to do with a mere literary renaissance. I recall, among a hundred similar instances, the case of a grocer's assistant in a small town in County Fermanagh whom the impulse of the Gaelic League had gripped and conquered. All day he wrapped up parcels of tea and sugar; at night he studied Gaelic; and when he had mastered it he began to teach it. That man was unconsciously building up a twofold character. The pleasures he denied himself, the ridicule he disregarded and lived down, the mental alertness which he cultivated, were in themselves a stringent course in self-discipline. He had found an ideal, a purpose, a supreme objective, to live and work for; and in pursuing them he could not but develop courage, veracity and the habit of clear thinking. But besides this he was becoming Irish; he was rearing a new and searching sense of nationality; he was stepping into possession of a historical birthright, the mere conception of which had never dawned on him before. Such a man, realizing himself and his country for the first time, would not, indeed could not, confine his awakened patriotism to the mere mastery of Gaelic. He would inevitably be led on to wishing Ireland to be Irish all through, Irish not only in her language, but in her industries, her government, her pastimes, her mode of life. That has been the experience of all countries that have suddenly revived and reconquered the use of their ancestral tongue. Such countries are filled with an irresistible ambition to be self-contained and self-sufficient, to have the sole ordering of their own affairs, to wear clothes of their own manufacture, to consume products of their own growing. It is so in Ireland. Dr. Douglas Hyde has himself described the Gaelic League as "an educational body tinged with an industrial strain." Its first object is literary; its second is social and economic. It is a strong and ardent supporter of temperance. It has thrown itself heart and soul into popularizing the sale of Irish goods and products. It has done more than any other agency to brighten village life, to raise the stand-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ard of rural economy, and to implant among the Irish peasantry a higher conception of the comforts and embellishments of the home. And that is the answer to the "practical" critic who scoffs at the Irish renaissance as so much sentimental nonsense. I am persuaded that, wherever the Gaelic League goes, a spirit of intellectual curiosity, of self-respect, of self-sacrifice, and of nationality based on knowledge, follows after. Life becomes more purposeful and less gloomy for those whom its propaganda has touched, their character is strengthened, their interests immensely widened. To lead the Irish people back to the baptismal font of their true nationality, to stimulate among them a study of their native tongue and the cultivation of all those elements that make them a distinctive entity, is not to render them unpractical or to unfit them in any way for material success in life. It is, on the contrary, to fill them with a new initiative, alertness, backbone and independence. All other Leagues in Irish history have destroyed character or demoralized it. The Gaelic League makes it.

There is something of real sublimity in such a movement; no man with any sensibilities at all can watch its progress unmoved. To link Irishmen with their past that they may the better face their future; to make clear to them that, just as Ireland has a past of which all Irishmen may be proud, so she has a future in which all Irishmen may unite; to check—I quote from one of the League's appeals—"the steam-roller of an imperfect and vulgarizing Anglicization which was being passed over the face of Ireland, blotting out everything native, no matter how valuable or how interesting, and leaving behind it one dead level of barren imitation and of hopeless intellectual stagnation"; to aim at creating "a self-contained, self-sufficing Irish Ireland, instead of a weak, backboneless imitation of England, a country wry-necked from looking over its left shoulder to see what the English fashion-plates are doing before it will stir a step itself"; to propagate a sense of nationality above politics and beyond them; to form character and marshal it against the hectic pretences, the malingering "patriotism," the shams, the lies and the basenesses that are the disfiguring curse of Irish life; to revive an ancient language, a great tradition of learning and culture, and the customs and recreations of an old and attractive society; and to mitigate the clash and jar of political, sectarian

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and social strife by providing Irishmen with a new interest of mind and heart, a broad and tolerant platform on which all may meet and fraternize—this seems to me a work of true greatness. It is an inspiring mission of internal reconciliation on which the directors of the League find themselves engaged. They will never be satisfied, as Dr. Douglas Hyde has said, "until, throughout the whole of Ireland, man grasps man in peace and unity."

I do not, however, intend it to be understood that the Gaelic League is carrying all before it. It has its full share of enemies and detractors. The Unionists for the most part stand aloof from it, seeing in the intensified spirit of nationality which it evokes one more menace to the maintenance of English influence, and it is by no means certain that the next Unionist Government may not set its face against the extension of the bilingual programme in the schools or withdraw the fees that the teachers at present receive for teaching Gaelic as an extra subject. From Trinity College, again, the headquarters of the culture and the prejudices of Protestant and Unionist Ireland, a steady stream of opposition is directed against the introduction of Irish into the higher education of the country; the idea of reviving it is mercilessly ridiculed; and even the claims of Gaelic to be anything more than a species of folk-lore are disallowed. The "practical" man of business, I need scarcely add, scoffs at the entire movement, asks triumphantly how Ireland will be a penny the better for its success, cannot conceive why any one should prefer a more or less bastard dialect to the language of a great literature and a great commerce, known and spoken the world over, and regards the attempt to resurrect it partly as a pose and partly as an outbreak of political lunacy. If the Irish, he exclaims, must learn something, if English does not satisfy them, let them learn French or German or some other useful and profitable tongue, instead of trying to revive a moribund language that is as inadequate as the Boer *taal* for the purposes of twentieth-century intercourse, and the effect of which can only be to separate those who speak it still further from the living world. But the most formidable obstacles in the path of the League's progress are the concealed and the invisible. In the presence of any such movement as this one asks one's self, instinctively and not without trepidation, Have the Irish the clear vision, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grit, the tenacity to carry it on to victory, or will they, after going a certain distance, fall as so often before, faint and weary, by the roadside? One dare not hazard a too-confident prophecy, but my faith, I confess, is very great. Here, at any rate, is a movement of mental and spiritual emancipation such as a bare decade ago would have been thought incredible. It is a movement wholly Irish in its inception and in its objective, springing from the people and supported by them; and it has already gone farther and has become involved in greater implications than those who launched it could possibly have foreseen. Ireland has definitely turned her back on all schemes of attaining Home Rule by force of arms. She has not abandoned the hope of winning it by Parliamentary pressure and peaceful agitation. But, in the mean time, she is realizing that there is one form of enfranchisement that it rests solely with herself to achieve, the enfranchisement of the national soul, the recovery of the lost or dwindling spirit of unity and historical consciousness. An Irish Ireland, I for one am convinced, is an Ireland morally made over, mistress of her fate, and strengthened beyond computation for both the material and the political struggle. It is to this consummation that the influence of the Gaelic League tends, and not of the League only, but of that whole renaissance which has already brought to birth the beginnings of a national drama and finds a vivid and appealing interpretation in a score of poets, essayists and playwrights.

One cannot, however, leave the matter there. To do so would be to have wholly failed to "place" the League among the many agitations of Irish life and politics. It is impossible to resist inquiring how a movement, so vital and energizing, affects or is affected by those other influences that play upon the Irish mind. What are its relations, for instance, with the Roman Catholic Church, and what with the politicians? How does it stand in regard to the English connection? In fighting the social and intellectual Anglicization of the country, is it also fighting, consciously or otherwise, for political separation? May not the spirit it has evoked, genuinely pro-Irish as it is, be not less genuinely anti-English? It will not do to reply to these queries by merely pointing to the Constitution of the League and noting the declaration of its "non-political and non-sectarian" character. You might as well try to avoid the influence of race in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the affairs of Austria-Hungary as of politics and religion in the affairs of Ireland. The League has, it is true, managed to preserve its independence of sects and parties. Though the great majority of its members are Nationalists and Catholics, its President is a Protestant and many Protestants and Unionists sit upon its councils. There is no such thing as a Gaelic League vote; no party can claim that it owns the League; as an organized body it takes no part in elections.

Very much the same may be said of the League's connection with the Church. The priesthood instinctively apprehended the dangers of allowing a popular movement of so formidable a character to develop without clerical guidance. The officials of the League, on their part, realizing that their best, if not their sole, chance of final success lay in introducing the teaching of Gaelic into the schools—and the schools in Ireland, I must again remind my readers, are a jealously guarded priestly preserve—were anxious not to alienate the Church. But, though the growth of the League owes an immense debt to the Catholic clergy, and would not have been possible without their assistance, it is, in my judgment, none the less true that the essential tendency of the Gaelic revival is towards anti-clericalism. Anything that makes Irishmen more independent and self-reliant, and that rouses them to a sustained intellectual exertion, must in time tell against priestly interference in secular affairs. A conflict with the Church, I regard as one of the certainties of the future. Nor is it, in my conviction, less axiomatic that the League is bound to have political results. The spirit it has created cannot be dissociated from politics. In emphasizing their racial separateness, the Irish are giving a new turn and a new vehemence to the old demand for Home Rule as well as arming themselves with a new power for the enforcement of that demand. The League, as I see it, while not a political army in itself, is a force from which political armies can be, will be and are being recruited. It may yet serve as a feeder for the Sinn Féin organization; its animating spirit is essentially the Sinn Féin spirit. Of all the agencies that are working for the regeneration of Ireland from within, the Gaelic League impresses me as the most hopeful, the most interesting and the most constructive.

SYDNEY BROOKS.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INJUNCTIONS IN LABOR DISPUTES.

BY FRANCIS M. BURDICK, DWIGHT PROFESSOR OF LAW IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

THE outburst of criticism upon the use of injunctions in labor controversies which characterized the last session of Congress was a sure harbinger of a Presidential campaign. During preceding sessions Senators and Representatives had appeared almost oblivious to the "judicial outrages" which "Federal tyrants," in the fashion of judges, were perpetrating upon good and innocent men by "Star Chamber proceedings, and traps for trying, convicting and imprisoning them." But the early days of the Sixtieth Congress witnessed a great awakening. Over thirty bills restraining and regulating the writ of injunction were introduced.

Mr. Henry, of Texas, in a speech from which the above-quoted phrases are taken, compliments himself upon being the earliest proponent in Congress of this sort of legislation. But even he must yield precedence in this great awakening to the President, who, in his Messages to Congress, called "attention to the need of some action in connection with the abuse of injunctions in labor cases." "It is all wrong," he declared, "to use the injunction to prevent the entirely proper and legitimate action of labor organizations in their struggle for industrial betterment, or under the guise of protecting property rights unwarrantably to invade the fundamental rights of the individual."

It is a sad defect, we submit, as well in the Presidential Messages as in the more impassioned speech of the Congressman, that the names of the judicial tyrants and abusers of the injunction are not vouchsafed. Surely, if such grievous wrongs have been committed, they are matters of record, and it should be easy to name each wrong-doer: to brand him with the charge,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Thou art the man." True, such a course would call for real courage, and, above all, for accurate information. But it is the only course that is fair towards the judiciary as a body. Moreover, any judge who, "under the guise of protecting property rights," has "unwarrantably invaded the fundamental rights of the individual," is unfit to wear the judicial ermine. If subject to removal by the President, he should be summarily dismissed. If not so subject, the President should make every proper effort to have him impeached. The fact that no such action has been taken, or effort put forth, justifies the suspicion that this alleged judicial offender is but a figment of Presidential campaign fancy.

Mr. Taft puts the case for legislative regulation much more mildly. He writes to the Ohio labor organizations:

"I have taken occasion to say in public speeches that the power to issue injunctions *ex parte* has given rise to certain abuses and injustices to the laborers engaged in the peaceful strike. Men leave employment on a strike, counsel for the employer applies to a judge and presents an affidavit averring fear of threatened violence, and making such a case on the *ex parte* statement that the judge feels called upon to issue a temporary restraining order. This is served upon all the strikers; they are not lawyers; their fears are aroused by the process with which they are not acquainted, and, although their purpose may have been entirely lawful, their common determination to carry through the strike is weakened by an order which they have never had an opportunity to question, and which is calculated to discourage their proceeding in their original purpose. To avoid this injustice, I believe, as I have already said, that the Federal statute might well be made what it was originally, requiring notice and a hearing before an injunction issues."

It will be observed that Mr. Taft makes no charge of judicial dereliction in this matter. The abuses and injustices are due to the misleading affidavits of the employer. Upon these affidavits he gets a temporary injunction against threatened violence by strikers; and the latter, mistaking it for an injunction against a peaceful strike, are weakened and discouraged, and the strike collapses. Here again the present writer yearns for a bill of particulars. He would like to have a concrete example of a strike collapsing in this way. For a number of years he has had occasion to follow this class of legislation with care, but without retainer from either employer or employed; and a case of the sort supposed by Mr. Taft has never fallen under his notice. Indeed, it is difficult to imagine such a case.

In the first place, whenever an *ex parte* injunction is granted,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

provision is made for an early hearing of a motion to show cause why it should not be continued. Such was Mr. Taft's own practice when judge, as shown in the Toledo, Ann Arbor and Michigan Railway case, where he granted an *ex parte* injunction against Arthur, Chief of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers. Undoubtedly, striking laborers are not lawyers; but every strike of sufficient importance to be enjoined is under the control of professional labor leaders, and commands abundant legal advice. It is well settled that an *ex parte* injunction will not be granted against a mere strike. Every laborer knows this. It was repeatedly decided by Judge Taft, and admitted by the hypothetical case of Candidate Taft; for his supposed affidavit avers fear of violence. Of course, the injunction would be confined to the case made by the affidavit and, hence, would restrain the strikers from the use of violence only. If the affidavit presented a case of threatened boycott, the order would enjoin against that; but, as Judge Taft said in Thomas *vs.* Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway (62 Fed., 803), when punishing Phelan for contempt:

"The distinction between an ordinary lawful and peaceable strike, entered upon to obtain concessions in the terms of the strikers' employment, and a boycott, is not a fanciful one, or one which needs the power of fine distinction to determine which is which. *Every laboring man recognizes the one or the other as quickly as a lawyer or a judge.*"

We need only to appeal from Candidate Taft to Judge Taft to discover that no set of laborers, who strike for a purpose entirely lawful, will be weakened, discouraged and defeated by a temporary injunction against violent boycotting or other unlawful misconduct on their part. Dealing with the argument that "a preliminary injunction ends the strike," a learned Federal judge has well said: "The defendants will not be required to abandon a lawfully conducted strike; and, if they do abandon it, this would be voluntary, and a confession on their part that only by lawlessness can the strike be successfully maintained."

In several reported cases, the original order has been modified upon defendants' request, because its terms were too broad or indefinite, and might seem to include mere lawful persuasion and other peaceful acts. Such are the cases of Plant *vs.* Woods (176 Mass., 492), Gray *vs.* Building Trades Council (91 Minn., 171) and Jetton-Dreckle Lumber Co. *vs.* Mather ([Fla.] 43 So.,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

590). In others, the order has been set aside, because the plaintiff's affidavits have been overborne by defendant's evidence, as in Allis Chalmers Co. *vs.* Iron Moulders' Union (150 Fed., 155), Wabash Railway Co. *vs.* Hannahan (121 Fed., 563) and Van der Plant *vs.* Undertakers' Association (70 N. J. Eq., 116). But in none, so far as the writer has discovered, has the temporary injunction caused a collapse of the strike. Indeed, as the Chancellor of New Jersey remarked in denying a motion to dissolve an order enjoining a threatened boycott: "If the defendants do not intend to do the things forbidden by the restraining order, then the order will do them no harm."

The fact referred to, that *ex parte* injunctions have been modified or set aside upon the opposing affidavits of striking laborers, shows that they know their rights and have only to assert them, precisely as any other litigants would do in case of an injunction, in order to secure their prompt and even jealous enforcement by the courts.

It is no indication of judicial abuse of this process that an *ex parte* order has been modified occasionally.

In the famous case of Arthur *vs.* Oakes (63 Fed., 310) the judge who granted the *ex parte* injunction modified it, upon Chief Arthur's application, by striking out a clause which might be construed to restrain him from giving friendly advice to the employees of the railways, as a body or individually. Said the judge:

> "The language of a writ of injunction should be clear and explicit, and, if possible, above criticism as to its meaning. Since, therefore, the language of this particular phrase may be misconceived, the motion in that respect will be granted, and the clause stricken from the writ."

Surely no fair-minded man can justly complain of judges who are thus ready to rectify mistakes; and, it is submitted, no one can study the judicial opinions in labor injunction cases without being impressed with the anxiety of the courts to do full justice to the employees.

The fact that, now and then, an *ex parte* order has been too broad in its terms, or has been induced by exaggerated, or even false, statements on the part of employers, furnishes no sufficient ground for the prohibitory legislation demanded by labor leaders. As well might legislation be invoked to prohibit courts of equity from granting injunctions against nuisances, trespass,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

waste and other irreparable injuries to property, because at times such a writ was issued improvidently or on untrustworthy affidavits. Moreover, the courts everywhere are demonstrating their ability and desire to limit injunctions in labor disputes to those acts or threats of laborers which are clearly unlawful, such as violence, intimidation or malicious boycotts.

The topic came before the Supreme Court of Florida for the first time in April, 1907. An *ex parte* order had been granted by a circuit judge, upon the application of the Jetton-Dreckle Lumber Company, restraining certain labor unions from enforcing their rules (which forbade their members working for any employer of non-union labor), and thus enforcing a sympathetic strike against the lumber company. The defendants answered, denying all acts of violence, or threats of intimidation, coercion or boycott, and asked that the injunction be dissolved. Upon this hearing (apparently before the judge who granted the *ex parte* order) the injunction was modified, so as to restrain the defendants only from acts and threats of violence, intimidation, coercion or boycott. The lumber company appealed from this modification, but the Supreme Court unanimously declared that "the decided weight, if not the universal rule, of the modern American cases sustains the action of the circuit court in refusing to extend the effects of the injunction so as to include the peaceable enforcement by labor unions of their reasonable rules." This declaration is supported by a long array of State and Federal decisions.

Another case which admirably illustrates the present attitude of our courts is that of the Wabash Railway Co. *vs.* Hannahan and others (121 Fed., 563), decided in 1903. The railroad company, upon a verified bill of complaint, obtained an *ex parte* restraining order against the defendants, as officers of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, "commanding them to refrain from ordering or causing a strike of complainant's employees." The defendants were given fifteen days within which to appear and show cause why the order should be dissolved or modified. They did appear, and by their sworn answer and affidavits convinced the court that they were not maliciously interfering with the Wabash employees; were not engaging in any intimidation or coercion of such employees, or in any unlawful combination against the Wabash

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Company's business, or the transportation of the United States mails or of interstate commerce, as had been charged in complainant's bill; whereupon the court vacated the *ex parte* order. "It results from the facts presented," said the judge, "that this court should not interfere with the exercise of the right, on the part of complainant's employees who are members of the Brotherhoods in question, of quitting the service of complainant in a body, by restraining the defendants, who are officers of the Brotherhood, from exercising the functions of their office, prerequisite thereto."

In neither of these cases, it will be observed, did the injunction operate to "weaken the common determination" of the laborers to strike or "discourage their proceeding in their lawful purpose." It would appear, therefore, that Mr. Taft is not happy in the only reason which he assigns for legislation on this topic.

Certainly, judicial discretion as to the time and manner of employing this extraordinary writ ought not to be interfered with by statute, unless the necessity therefor is clearly shown. It is a fundamental rule of equity jurisprudence that this writ is not to be issued in doubtful cases; that "it will be refused till the courts are satisfied that the case before them is of a right about to be destroyed, irreparably injured, or great and lasting injury about to be done by an illegal act." It is equally fundamental, writes Justice Story, "that courts of equity constantly decline to lay down any rule which shall limit their power and discretion as to particular cases, in which such injunctions shall be granted or withheld." He adds:

> "There is wisdom in this course, for it is impossible to foresee all the exigencies of society which may require their aid to protect rights or redress wrongs. The jurisdiction of these courts, thus operating by special injunction, is manifestly indispensable for the purposes of social justice in a great variety of cases, and, therefore, should be fostered and upheld by a steady confidence."

One of the exigencies referred to by Judge Story was presented by the attempt of Debs, Phelan and other officers of the American Railway Union to paralyze interstate commerce over a large portion of this country. They declared that their attempt was "inspired by a purpose to subserve the public good"; and that if their struggle was successful every wage-earner in the land would share in its beneficial effects. But it was waged with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a ruthless disregard of the rights of non-union laborers, of the railways and of the public. The struggle was precipitated by a strike of the employees of the Pullman Car Company in May, 1894, because of its refusal to restore wages which had been reduced the year before. The union threatened the Pullman Company with a boycott unless it acceded to a proposed arbitration with its employees. Upon its refusal, Debs, the president of the union, formally declared the boycott, on June 26th. All railway employees were ordered by Debs to refuse to handle Pullman cars. If this refusal did not force their employers to cut out such cars, the employees were to strike, and to make every effort to tie up and cripple the recalcitrant railways. So successfully was the scheme carried out that, on June 29th, Debs telegraphed to Phelan: "About twenty-five lines now paralyzed. More following. Tremendous blockade."

Of this scheme Judge Taft said, in Thomas *vs.* Cincinnati, New Orleans and Texas Pacific Railway (62 Fed., 803):

> "The gigantic character of the conspiracy of the American Railway Union staggers the imagination. . . . Debs, Phelan and their associates proposed, by inciting employees of all the railways of the country to suddenly quit their service without any dissatisfaction with the terms of their own employment, to paralyze utterly all the traffic by which the people live, and in this way to compel Pullman, for whose acts neither the public nor the railway companies are in the slightest degree responsible, and over whose acts they can lawfully exercise no control, to pay more wages to his employees."

In the execution of this conspiracy, employees who refused to join in the strike, and those who took the places of strikers, were assaulted and driven from their posts of duty. The strikers and their sympathizers took forcible possession of the railways within and adjacent to Chicago, and prevented the passage of any trains for some days. They derailed engines and cars; assailed passengers, as well as non-striking employees, with stones and other missiles, and even fired upon them. More than a thousand loaded freight-cars were set on fire and destroyed, as well as numerous signal-towers; and many lives were sacrificed as the result of mob violence.

That even Debs was shocked at the havoc he had wrought is apparent from the following statement which he issued on July 12th:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The strike, small and comparatively unimportant in its inception, has extended in every direction, until now it involves or threatens, not only every public interest, but the peace, security and prosperity of our common country. The contest has waged fiercely. It has extended far beyond the limits of interests originally involved, and has laid hold of a vast number of industries and enterprises in no wise responsible for the differences that led to the trouble. Factory, mill, mine and shop have been silenced; wide-spread demoralization has sway. The interests of multiplied thousands of people are suffering. The common welfare is seriously menaced. The public peace and tranquillity imperilled. Grave apprehensions for the future prevail."

While this state of things existed, the courts were applied to for injunctions against Debs and his fellow conspirators; the writs were issued, served and disobeyed; whereupon these leaders of the mob and flouters of judicial writs were arrested and jailed for contempt of court. This was the beginning of the end. True, Federal troops had been called out and were engaged in defending life and property against mob violence. But it was the action of the courts that dealt the death blow to the gigantic conspiracy of Debs and his fellows, to take the American people by the throat and starve them into forcing the Pullman Company to run its business in accordance with their demands. In his testimony before the Federal Strike Commission, Debs said:

"As soon as the employees found that we were arrested and taken from the scene of action, they became demoralized, and that ended the strike. It was not the soldiers. It was simply the United States courts that ended the strike, by restraining us from discharging our duties as officers and representatives of our employees."

Should the power to issue injunctions in such a case be taken from the courts?

Congressman William B. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, answers, Yes. In his opinion, an injunction should never be granted in labor troubles, even though the concerted and violent action of boycotting laborers paralyzes business "over all the lines of the United States."* Similar views have been expressed by Mr. Gompers, President of the American Federation of Labor, by Mr. Spelling, its counsel, and other labor leaders. They hold that no property right is invaded by a labor boycott, even when it results in forcing non-union laborers out of employment and in paralyzing the employer's business. They ask for a statutory

* Hearings on House Bill 19745 at p. 507.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

definition of property which shall make it clear that there is "no property or property rights in labor or the labor power of any person or persons, nor in the patronage of any person." * At their request Congressman Pearre introduced a bill declaring that "no right to continue the relation of employer and employee, or to assume or create such relation with any particular person or persons, or at all, or to carry on business of any particular kind, or at any particular place, or at all, shall be construed, held, considered or treated as property or as constituting a property right."

Verily, were that bill to pass and to be held constitutional, it would revolutionize existing conceptions of property rights. What a boon it would prove to the Standard Oil Company and similar organizations, in the efforts which they are charged with making to crush rivals! And it would legalize the boycott in its worst forms. It is now well settled that "a person's occupation or calling, by means of which he earns a livelihood for himself and those dependent upon him, is property, and entitled to protection as such, aside from the goods, chattels, money or effects employed in connection therewith." † Such has been the doctrine of the common law for centuries.

But Mr. Gompers and his school of social economists propose to change all this. They insist upon the right to paralyze the business of any employer whom they deem unfair, as they did in the Danbury Hat case, and as they tried to do in the case of the George Jonas Glass Company. Because the latter company would not conduct its business in accordance with the rules of the Glass Bottle Blowers' Association, one of which was that the company should employ only one apprentice to fifteen journeymen, the association ordered all union men to leave the company's employ; induced non-union men to quit by promising to take care of them and pay them good wages if they went out; coerced patrons of the company into withdrawing all patronage by threats of a boycott; and collected the strikers in a body and encamped them near the company's factory to terrorize the neighborhood, and to prevent persons who wished to labor from reaching the company' works.

The result was not only a great property loss to the company, but a flagrant invasion of the rights of non-union laborers, cul-

* Hearings on House Bill 19745, pp. 51, 637, 647.

† Gray *vs.* Building Trades Council, 91 Minn., 171.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

minating in the assassination of an employee who attempted to return to work.

Messrs. Gompers and Wilson assert that in such cases the purpose of the labor organization is not to injure the employer or destroy his business, but simply to secure what they deem to be fair working terms for themselves. That is very euphemistic. When the representatives of these organizations appear before a recalcitrant employer they use no such soft words. They give him plainly to understand, as in Purvis *vs.* Local No. 500, United Brotherhood of Carpenters (214 Pa., 348), that he must unionize his plant or quit business. "Their means of persuasion," said the court in that case, "are the destruction of the property of those whom they would persuade." "How absurd is it," declared another court, "to call this peaceable persuasion, and how absurd to argue that, if the law attempts to prevent it, the rights of workmen to organize for their common benefit is frustrated."

Another euphemism of the Gompers school is that a boycott is always spontaneous. There is no conspiracy about it. A great variety of organizations, and their thousands of members, of a sudden and at the same moment experience the conviction that not one of them should wear the Danbury hat, or use any product of the Bucks Stove and Range Company. Hence they withdraw their patronage. Indeed, the conviction is so keen and dominant that they are unanimously impelled to persuade all persons with whom they deal to cease patronizing these unfair establishments. Incidentally, they notify such persons that if the latter continue to wear Danbury hats or use Bucks stoves, it will be at the peril of giving up all beneficial business intercourse with the notifiers and their friends.

This plea of spontaneity was interposed by Phelan when brought before Judge Taft for contempt in violating an injunction. "He would have the court believe," said Judge Taft, "that what occurred was wholly spontaneous and not through his agency, and that his business was, if there should be such coincidental spontaneity resulting in a strike, to prevent disorder and to look after the sick." Unfortunately for Phelan, his telegrams to Debs and his speeches were matters of record, and proved conclusively that the boycott was the work of a few leaders and not the result of a spontaneous outburst of feeling among the mass of employees.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Objection is made to the use of injunctions in labor controversies, on the ground that there is an adequate remedy at law. Congressman Wilson puts it in this way:

> "Every State in the Union through its Legislature, when it has enacted into law what is a remedy in cases of that kind, has provided a remedy against the use of force, has provided penalties and punishments where force is used. The legislative body has determined what is an adequate remedy at law, and, notwithstanding that fact, our courts assume that there is no adequate remedy at law, and issue restraining orders preventing the use of force."

Here again the labor leaders contend for the application of a different rule to them from that which applies to other violators of the law. The Legislature has provided penalties and punishments for the maintenance of a house of ill fame; but if such a house, or any other form of public nuisance, is maintained in a residential locality, it may be enjoined by any neighbor whose property is injured thereby. (Cranford *vs.* Tyrrell, 128 N. Y., 341.)

Perhaps the objection most strenuously urged to the use of injunctions in labor cases, with the accompanying contempt proceedings for the punishment of their violation, is that it results in a denial of a trial by jury to persons charged with crime. For a full and convincing reply to this objection the reader is referred to the great opinion of our highest court *in re* Debs (158 U. S., 564). We have not space even to summarize it here. But this should be noted: "A court enforcing obedience to its orders by proceedings for contempt is not executing the criminal laws of the land, but only securing to suitors the right which it has adjudged them entitled to." Contempt proceedings against a labor leader for violation of an injunction are instituted and conducted precisely as are such proceedings against any other violator of this writ. Why should the law-breaking striker or boycotter be accorded a special privilege in the matter of injunction contempts? Moreover, if the violator of an injunction is thereafter indicted for a crime which he committed while engaged in such violation, the contempt proceedings have no relevancy to the issue in the criminal trial. The two are wholly separate and distinct. The penalties imposed by the criminal law furnish no standard for the punishment in contempt proceedings.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The topic of this paper has furnished the theme for voluminous and passionate appeals before the platform committees of our recent National Conventions. Fortunately, as the writer thinks, neither of the great parties has committed itself to any such doctrine as that contained in the Pearre bill, while both have recorded their confidence in the courts. True, the Democratic platform pledges provision "for trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt"—that is, of contempt committed outside the precincts of the court; but it also declares that "the parties to all judicial proceedings should be treated with rigid impartiality."

It seems probable, therefore, that no radical legislation on this topic will result from the impending Presidential campaign, whichever candidate is elected; but that the courts will be allowed to control the writ of injunction, in the future as in the past, without the hindrance of statutes enacted in the heat of partisan excitement.

FRANCIS M. BURDICK.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ESPERANTO IN GERMANY.

BY OTTO SIMON.

THE first advocate of Esperanto in Germany was Leopold Einstein, of Nuremberg. From the very beginning he had penetrated the deficiencies of Volapük; but, making the best of it, he espoused the cause of that artificial language until 1888, when a copy of Zamenhof's grammar fell into his hands. Notwithstanding his advanced age and severe bodily afflictions, he became an ardent apostle of Esperanto, and displayed in its service a feverish activity. As late as a few months before his death in 1890 he wrote to Zamenhof: "I am old and sick, and will not live to see the triumph of our beautiful and sacred undertaking. But you will soon, soon witness it in all its glory." The geometrician Trompeter (Schalke) became another champion who made great sacrifices for the propaganda. Zamenhof has repeatedly acknowledged that without the interposition of these two Germans he would have despaired of the success of his work. Then Trompeter also died in 1902, and the first attempts of the Esperanto movement in Germany were soon crushed by the indifference of public opinion. However, Esperanto was no more homeless. France, Sweden and the Bohemian provinces of Austria had already given it admittance, and from foreign countries it had necessarily, sooner or later, to find its way back to Germany.

The first guide was the Bohemian teacher Theodore Cejka, of Bistritz-on-Hostein, who added to his Bohemian "Esperanto Review" a German supplement with correspondence lessons. This review, which Cejka had edited for three years with great sacrifices, long ago ceased publication; but, thanks to its German supplement, there are now German Esperantists to be met in all the towns of Bohemia and Moravia, where more than one

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

language is spoken. More substantial aid the German Esperanto movement received from Switzerland. Jean Borel, who has devoted much time to the problem of neutral auxiliary language in general and to Volapük in particular, and who also commands thoroughly five modern languages, was won over to Esperanto at the beginning of this century. In 1902, with some fellow spirits, he founded the "Schweizer Esperanto-Gesellschaft," and was elected its vice-president. An extensive tour abroad, which brought him to Hungary, Servia, Rumania, Russia, etc., strengthened him in his view that, notwithstanding his knowledge of many languages, he was in a great part of the civilized world condemned to "numbness and dumbness." He then became thoroughly convinced of the usefulness of Esperanto, because he met in many places Esperantists to whom he could make himself understood only in this new language. He also succeeded in gaining for the new language the interest of his brother, the owner of a publishing business in Berlin, who also published Jean Borel's effective pamphlet for the advancement of Esperanto. A few weeks later, Jean Borel decided to settle permanently in Berlin. In order to push forward the Esperanto movement in Germany he published in November, 1903, a modest monthly, "*Esperantistische Mitteilungen,*" which with the beginning of 1905 appeared considerably enlarged under the title: "*Germana Esperantisto,*" and brought about the union of all the Esperantists scattered through the country. On this occasion it became apparent that the interest of the public surpassed all expectations; yet even now some Esperantists were unacquainted with the others, and most of the earlier Esperantists believed the movement had entirely died away. Some, it is true, occupied themselves with the language as a private amusement; but for serious work on a large scale they needed a centre, an organ, an organization. Through the "*Esperantistische Mitteilungen*" the rank and file of the movement became acquainted with each other; in Jean Borel they found their organizer. The latter founded, jointly with Professor Schmidt, Mehlisch, and Professor Wetekampf, a group in Berlin in 1903, and this example was soon imitated in many other cities. The Esperanto movement, emerging from the period of uncertain grouping and sporadic successes, had arrived at the period of a systematic propaganda.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Although small Esperanto circles had been organized before at Kiel and Gratz, they were not active in making converts. But with the foundation of the Berlin group the ice was broken. After Berlin came Brunswick in February, 1904. A month later was formed in Munich a group whose president, Captain Meier, had organized a quiet but consistent missionary movement as early as 1890. Soon after groups were formed in Hamburg, Frankfort-on-Main and Stuttgart; and, since the beginning of 1905, hardly a month has passed without the foundation of one or two Esperanto societies. At present they number about forty. This result must be valued the more as the German press has until recently been rather unfriendly to the movement. The press either attempted to kill it with silence or indulged in cheap witticisms at its expense. Refutations of malicious articles were often declined. It was, therefore, very important that the Esperantists had at their disposal since January, 1905, a copious monthly organ, "*Germana Esperantisto,*" edited by Borel. Since the successes of the two Esperanto congresses (in Boulogne-sur-Mer, in 1905, and Geneva, in 1906), however, the attitude of a part of the German press has been more favorable. The "*Praktische Wegweiser*" and "*Das Echo,*" two widely circulated periodicals, are now earnestly taking part in the propaganda, and almost the whole South German press has been won over to the movement by the unceasing efforts of Professor Christaller, of Stuttgart. Besides, many smaller periodicals ("*Mondo,*" "*Weltwarte,*" "*Handels-Akademie,*" "*Deutschlands Jugend,*" etc.) regularly devote space to Esperanto.

A conclusive evidence of the fact that Esperanto has not merely found sympathy, but is earnestly studied, is the increase of the Esperanto method-literature. As early as 1888, Einstein had published a German method, which, however, considered the propaganda rather than the pedagogics. He was followed in 1890, by Meier, with the first methodical grammar; by Fried, who in a series of articles had acquainted the harmonizers of systems with the splendid aims of the auxiliary language. A year later appeared the "*Vollständiges Lehrbuch,*" a complete method, by Jean Borel, which bears the approbation of Zamenhof, and has since passed through six editions. In the same year appeared, in the popular "*Miniatur-Bibliothek,*" a method by Mielck, and soon after a method by Jürgensen. Schröder,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the meritorious honorary president of the Vienna group, wrote in 1905 a methodical grammar which is intended for self-instruction of those who have not a thorough knowledge of the grammar of their mother tongue. Lately have appeared methods by Stark, Mainzer, Stephan Büschel, and last, but not least, Schramm. Special mention should also be made of the dictionaries by Zamenhof and Jürgensen, published in 1905, the third edition of which appeared at the end of 1906.

Meanwhile, the various single groups felt the necessity of coming in closer contact with one another. Under the presidency of Dr. Mybs, of Hamburg, the most influential Esperantists of Germany assembled in May, 1906, at Brunswick. Here an organization, the "Germana Esperantista Societa" was founded, embracing all the Esperantist societies of Germany. The "*Germana Esperantisto*" was selected as the official organ. Dr. Mybs, Drs. Hanauer and Schuck were entrusted with the management of the association. Two Austrians and one Swiss were appointed to the larger board of managers.

Among Germans abroad Esperanto was introduced even before it was promoted in Germany. Thus, in Austria a group exists in almost every large city. The Reichenberg group took part in the German-Bohemian exhibition and was awarded the gold medal. German Switzerland also manifests a favorable disposition toward Esperanto, which was largely influenced by the second international congress, held in Geneva in 1906. The energetic president of the Swiss Esperanto Society, Pastor Schneeberger, from German Switzerland, was chosen chairman of this congress, his election evidencing the high esteem the German Esperantists enjoy in the international Esperanto world. This esteem is further shown by the election of nine German Esperantists to the "Lingva Comitato" (language committee), which has its seat in Paris. This committee was organized by the first Esperanto congress held at Boulogne in 1905, from among the most experienced Esperantists, as the highest authority in linguistic controversies. Barthel, the vice-president of the international lodge of Freemasons; Foerster, Schmidt and Meier belong to the editorial board of the most important scientific periodical, "*Internacia Scienca Revuo.*" All the international Esperanto periodicals have Germans as constant contributors. The stenographic system proposed for Esperanto by Schneeberger finds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

favor also abroad, and was practically applied at both international congresses. Schuck has given much joy to the pioneers of this movement by his original album of 114 of the best-known Esperantists. Among them are fourteen Germans. The foreign Esperantists have also strongly supported the German propaganda, first of all by the translation of selected works of German literature into Esperanto. The Russians, Devyatnin, Gernet and Kaufmann; the Poles, Kabe, Grabovski and Belmont; the Frenchman Bouçon and the Englishman Cefec, participated in these translations. Cefec has rendered great service to the German propaganda by his pamphlet *"Esperanto-Schlüssel."* Zamenhof has not only paved the way by his wonderful translation of Schiller's *"Robbers"* and single poems of Schiller, Goethe, Uhland and Heine, but has also raised the spirits and confidence of the champions of Esperanto by his visits to the Esperantists of Berlin and Frankfort. Couturat has issued his book, *"La langue auxiliaire international,"* also in German, and in an article in the *"Deutsche Revue"* has cleared up misunderstandings of the principles of the auxiliary languages that have lately arisen.

The chief obstacle to the German Esperanto movement, apathy, has now been overcome. Only three years ago, at the Berlin meeting, for which thousands of invitations were issued and sent to all teachers, but fifteen persons appeared, although a distinguished scholar, Professor Schmidt, of Potsdam, had been announced as the main speaker; whereas, in November, 1906, Professor Ostwald spoke in Berlin in favor of the Esperanto idea amid the thundering applause of many hundreds; and, a few weeks later, Professor Schmidt treated the same subject before a large and select audience. As late as the nineteenth of April, 1904, Fritz Mauthner could assert in the *"Berliner Tageblatt"* that only faddists occupied themselves with Esperanto. At present this paper from time to time publishes items referring to the movement. The scholars who, with the exception of Ostwald, Foerster, Schmidt and Schuchardt, originally stood aloof from Esperanto, no longer consider it unworthy of notice. Four years ago, an application requesting the Association of the Academies to take an interest in the problem of an international auxiliary language had only four signatures of German scholars; to-day, no less than twenty German scholars are interested. Next after

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the report of Schuchardt, who was commissioned by the Vienna Academy to investigate this problem, the chief cause of the advance is the work of Ostwald, who, already in 1903, before the German Ingenieur-Verein at Munich, urged the possibility of an artificial auxiliary language, and in his "*Natur Philosophie*" gave a strictly scientific argument in support of his view, which he defended in "*Die Neue Freie Presse*" in 1904 against the philologist Gomperz. In his lectures at the Salzburg summer high school in 1903, he came out for the first time specifically for Esperanto, which in the next year he recommended at Berlin, Leipsic, Prague, Teplitz and Vienna, as the best solution of the auxiliary language problem. An adroit opponent of the Esperantists arose in the person of Professor Diels, the rector of the Berlin University, who, because of his warnings against Esperanto on the ground that it was injurious to national sentiment, could from the beginning count on the approval of all chauvinists. His reproaches have, however, been met by Schmidt, Couturat and Ostwald in three of the most prominent German periodicals. After all, the chauvinistic prejudice is still widely spread. The same circles that at an earlier stage declined to occupy themselves at all with Esperanto, on the ground of its alleged hopelessness, now see in this neutral auxiliary language a menace to the sacred fortunes of the nation. Other opposition to Esperanto has lately materialized in the newest projectors, who cannot rest through jealousy of Zamenhof's fame; but they cannot succeed and, like Professor Diels, they do their share to enliven the public discussion of the question of the world language and to prevent a dangerous indifferentism.

The confidence which has been placed in Esperanto by the German public manifests itself also in the greater interest accorded to it by the commercial world. A society of merchants, "Progresso," publishes in Frankfort the Esperanto periodical "*Eksport Jurnalo*," a number of manufactured articles bear the trade-mark "Esperanto," and probably the most important sign of the times is the fact that in some commercial schools Esperanto has lately been taught experimentally. Some commercial houses already supplement their announcements with the notice: "Oni corespondas Esperante" ("We correspond in Esperanto"). Some of them even advertise in Esperanto periodicals.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

At the very cradle of Esperanto we find, on the one hand, men engaged in industrial pursuits who hope, for practical considerations, that the new method will furnish the future language of commerce; on the other hand, scholars see in it the future language of science. The International Esperanto Association has laid before the scholars and friends of science a declaration in which is expressed the earnest hope that the scientists at the international congresses will always use Esperanto, that articles written in Esperanto will find place in the prominent scientific periodicals, which shall likewise print an index in Esperanto of those articles that appear in the national languages. This declaration was signed by more than fifty learned Germans with academic degrees.

Moreover, the idealists hope that Esperanto may serve as a conqueror, or at least as a mitigator, of national animosities, as an instrument to conciliate the nations and to establish universal brotherhood. Some may go a little too far in their keen anticipations, but they have a perfect right to point out that the furtherance of mutual love among the nations was the real guiding star that Zamenhof followed in elaborating his great work. They can also point to the fact that, notwithstanding political differences of the day, the German Esperantists have always met with hearty and friendly sentiments among the various nations and creeds. Not often in the history of the world have idealists and practical workers united so closely in common activity as they have now in advancing Esperanto in Germany; and even if the first steps of the Germans were timorous and uncertain, the dangers incident to the infancy of the cause have been overcome, and the international Esperanto congress which is about to meet on German soil will prove to all the world that the Germans have done their duty in this beneficent movement.

OTTO SIMON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY JESSIE B. RITTENHOUSE, EDWARD PORRITT AND BRANDER MATTHEWS.

"LETTERS OF THE WORDSWORTH FAMILY."*

UPON the assumption that no form of biography is at once so intimate, authentic and delightful as letters, Professor William Knight, who has done such admirable work in the study of Wordsworth, supplements his former labor by the publication of all the available letters of the poet, from his early youth to his death, together with those which throw illuminating side-lights upon his life and personality, by his wife, his sister, his daughter, his son-in-law and Sarah Hutchinson.

It would seem, at this date, that all the Wordsworth correspondence must have found its way into biographies and memoirs, but, on the contrary, a large number of these letters appear for the first time, and among them a group from Wordsworth and Dorothy to Coleridge, covering a period of eight years after their association at Alfoxden, discovered only in the autumn of 1906 by Mr. Gordon Wordsworth, grandson of the poet, among the effects of Miss Quillinan of Loughrigg Holm.

These letters alone, with their poignant interest, written out of the painful hope and fear of those first years of Coleridge's weakness, would render invaluable these volumes, even though unsupplemented by many others to friends of Coleridge in which one obtains a newly vivid and ineffaceable impression of this most magical mind of his epoch.

So inextricable is Coleridge's life from that of Wordsworth and so does he dominate the latter's thought, even in absence,

* "Letters of the Wordsworth Family. From 1787 to 1855." Collected and edited by William Knight. In three volumes. Boston and London: Ginn & Co., publishers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that his influence upon Wordsworth, as revealed in these letters, becomes psychic, as if a spirit hovered ever behind. Literature affords no parallel to this association, in its inner sympathy and outward diversity. One follows Wordsworth in his harmonious, luminous life, as a planet held aloft in an unswerving orbit by the gravity of the spiritual law, and Coleridge, in his passionate and losing strife, as an errant star in perilous deflection, unpoised, at last, but lighting the bounds of space as it falls.

A new reading of Coleridge is, in many respects, made necessary by the intimate disclosures of these letters. The irrevocable mistake of his life, that of his marriage, assumes a significance not attached to it in his biographies, and its negative and disintegrating effect upon him is seen to have influenced his habits more than his habits reacted upon his life. The sordid, superficial, undivining nature of Mrs. Coleridge, concerned, even in her misfortune, but with the world's comment, was so alien and repellent to that of Coleridge that even the formal bond between them became a spiritual perversion. The accepted impression that Coleridge deliberately deserted his family, after succumbing to his weakness, is greatly modified by the evidence of these letters, wherein one learns of the years in which he struggled for adjustment of impossible conditions and gave the marvellous powers of his mind to the foredoomed task of developing in Mrs. Coleridge qualities, both of intellect and temperament, which nature had denied her. The stultifying effect of this association, and the subsequent discord and wretchedness which it entailed, are forces not sufficiently reckoned with in appraising the aborted genius of Coleridge. One may reckon them better by contrast with what he produced in the "miraculous year" of his first association with the Wordsworths.

In his turn, Coleridge acted as a fuse to the slow-moving, contemplative mind of Wordsworth, whose genius sympathy alone could render creative. Had Dorothy Wordsworth and Coleridge been removed from his life, he must have remained the diffuse moralist of the "Prelude" and "Excursion" upon which, in his critical blindness, he placed the emphasis of his claim to recognition. No poet had ever such imperturbable confidence in his own immortality, nor miscalculated more, perhaps, the specific work by which his faith would be justified.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a letter to Lady Beaumont he cites Coleridge as saying that "every great and original writer must himself create the taste by which he is to be relished," and so discloses the source, or the striking parallel, of a line of our own great cosmic egoist, Walt Whitman, "I myself create the only taste by which I can be appreciated." Apropos of Wordsworth as a source for other poets, one is newly reminded by these letters that Théophile Gautier's exquisite "*L'Art*" is almost a paraphrase of certain lines written by Wordsworth as an inscription for a niche of Lady Beaumont's winter garden.

Upon the borrowings of his contemporaries, Wordsworth was severe enough, and his egoism often led him into absurd suspicions and strictures, such as that in a letter to Henry Taylor, accusing Byron of purloining his own conception of nature:

> "So far as I am acquainted with his works, they [his obligations to Wordsworth] are most apparent in the third canto of 'Childe Harold,' not so much in particular expressions, though there is no want of these, as in the tone (assumed rather than natural) of enthusiastic admiration of nature and a sensibility to her influence. Of my writings you need read no more than the blank verse to the River Wye to be convinced of this."

Wordsworth's antipathy to Byron was fundamental, ineradicable, whereas Byron, having repented him of his early folly, became a genuine admirer of Wordsworth, but those critics who, following Wordsworth's own lead, can find in Byron's lava-poured lines the meditative Wordsworthian mood, must possess a richer equipment of imagination than of insight.

The philosophical so predominated in Wordsworth, that he could not tolerate the personal nor admit its claim to perpetuity, and were it not for the supplementary letters of his family, we should have, from this correspondence, no more notion of Wordsworth's personality than of that of a being from another sphere. On the contrary, no biography yet written of him may be placed with these letters in unfolding, in sequence and symmetry, the progress of his art. For Wordsworth's life was hidden in his art, his self-expression is purely spiritual and, in this regard, more complete than that of any of his fellow poets.

It follows that Wordsworth was deficient in charm as a letter-writer; charm, as such, fleeing the abstract, detached and impersonal. The constitutional trouble with Wordsworth as a corre-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spondent was identical with that which, in the absence of inspiration, afflicted him as a poet, his inability to forget himself and give free course to his impulses. He contemplates himself and his own emotions, chiefly moral, until his letters become homilies. When he touches upon personality, it is at once robbed of its essence. Compare his comment to Francis Wrangham, upon Mary Hutchinson, soon to be his bride,

"Miss Hutchinson I can recommend to you as a most amiable and good creature, with whom you would converse with great pleasure,"

with

"She was a phantom of delight,

. . . . .

A lovely apparition, sent
To be a moment's ornament"—

and one will understand the distinction between Wordsworth as a correspondent and Wordsworth as a poet. Nevertheless, he holds one, even in his letters, by a singular spell. As the range of his correspondence is wide, no phase of his mind is left uninterpreted. Social and political conditions are treated more fully, perhaps, than matters of art. The letters comprise a long series to Sir George and Lady Beaumont, to Henry Crabb Robinson, to Coleridge, Scott, Southey, De Quincey, Samuel Rogers, Cottle, "Christopher North," Henry Reed, of Philadelphia, with many isolated letters of great interest, such as that to Gladstone, in regard to the Laureateship.

Interspersed throughout the volumes, as they occur chronologically, are the intimate and delightful letters of Dorothy Wordsworth and other members of the poet's family, which relieve the gravity of his own and leaven the collection with the magnetic personal quality, the charm, which Wordsworth himself lacked. One is impressed constantly by the manner in which all those associated with Wordsworth conduced to his art; not from coercion, but from voluntary sympathy. No poet was ever companioned more inspiringly nor sustained by greater faith. Had he not been poised and buttressed in hope, he must have been unresponsive to all spiritual sympathy.

In their store of fresh material, illuminating, by both data and comment, the characters of most of Wordsworth's great contemporaries; in the light flashed upon his own nature from many facets, and in the complete expression of his opinions upon sub-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jects of permanent interest,—these letters will henceforth be indispensable to the student of Wordsworth, and they supply much that will be invaluable to future biographies, not only of Wordsworth, but of his fellow poets.

JESSIE B. RITTENHOUSE.

DELANE, OF "THE TIMES." *

IF there is any one department of English biography that is lean and weak it is the biography of newspaper editors. Not more than three or four of these biographies have appeared since the Life of Baines, of the "Leeds Mercury," was published in 1851; and those of Robinson, of the "Daily News," and Cowen, of the "Newcastle Daily Chronicle," to recall only the more recently published biographies, are proof of the difficulty that seems to be experienced in depicting the life and work of men in the front rank of English journalism—men who have built up great newspapers. Mr. Dasent had an unusual opportunity; for as the nephew of Delane he was in possession of more correspondence and other valuable data concerning the "Times" in the period when it was outdistancing all its London competitors, creating standards in newspaper work that were maintained all over England and unchallenged for half a century and firmly establishing its place as the world's greatest newspaper, than were ever in the possession of any man who was about to write the life of an editor, or deal with an epoch-making period in the history of British journalism. He has adequately grasped Delane's close relations with the statesmen and politicians of the period between 1840 and 1879, when he was editor of the "Times." Mr. Dasent realizes, and he makes the reader realize, that no other English editor was ever so long or so closely in touch with the men of both political parties who were governing England during Delane's reign at the "Times" office. He shows how anxious these statesmen were to stand well with Delane; how at times they deferred to him in larger as well as in minor affairs of state; and the extent to which Delane was taken into their counsels and confidence. Mr. Dasent claims all

* "John Thaddeus Delane: Editor of 'The Times.' His Life and Correspondence." By Arthur Irwin Dasent. With Portraits and Other Illustrations. Two Volumes, pp. ix, 328; vii, 376. New York, Charles Scribner's Sons.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that it is possible to claim for Delane as a power in the state; so much so that he exalts him into what he describes as the Prime Minister of the Public. He has, moreover, been almost overawed by Delane's high position in society and his acceptance in the homes of the families of what it was wont to describe as the governing classes of England. In politics and in society Delane's unique position does not suffer in the least in Mr. Dasent's representation of it. Of eulogy also there is no lack, even if it is not always discriminating. Men like Bright and Cobden, for whom Delane had scant regard, Mr. Dasent treats at times with obvious injustice; and he fights all Delane's battles over again with the zeal of a feudal squire. In a word, Delane could not have desired a more intensely loyal and eulogistic biographer; but in depicting Delane as the greatest of newspaper-makers in the period between the reign of George III and the middle years of Queen Victoria's reign Mr. Dasent has fallen short of his opportunities.

Mr. Dasent is seemingly not a journalist. He is at any rate not familiar with the technique of journalism; and he has no appreciation of the news instinct which was so magnificently developed in Delane. Nor can Mr. Dasent be familiar with the history of English journalism; for if the history of journalism during the thirty-seven years that Delane was editor of the "Times"—the period of its new political power and of its greatest development—had any interest for him he would cheerfully have sacrificed the pages which he devotes to the appearance of the streets of London between Printing House Square and the West End when Delane was appointed editor in 1840, for a sketch of the history of the "Times" between 1785 and 1840; an outline of the position it then occupied in English public life and of its hold in the capitals of Continental Europe; and a brief survey of the position of the London and provinical press at the time when Delane, then only twenty-three years of age, succeeded Barnes as editor. Anything adequate of this nature is lacking; and, more remarkable still, nowhere in the two volumes is there from Dasent's pen a good description of Delane at work. But fortunately a large part of the volumes consists of the letters that Delane wrote to Sir George Webbe Dasent—father of the biographer—who from 1840 to 1870 was Delane's associate editor. These letters, like many of the other letters

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

contained in the two volumes are indifferently edited. There is a tantalizing lack of foot-notes to elucidate personal references and references to events; but from the letters that Delane wrote to Dasent while on his vacations it is easily possible to estimate Delane's position as a great newspaper-maker; and it is on his work in this respect that Delane's larger and more permanent fame must always rest.

Delane had a genius for newspaper-making; for realizing of what the ever-widening constitutency of readers of the "Times" would like to be informed, and for placing his men at home and abroad where they could do the best work for the great newspaper they were serving. He had a keen and alert perception of good newspaper writing, whether for the editorial or the special correspondence columns or for the news pages; and an eye for the niceties of typography and make-up that would have made him a great printer had fortune not destined him for a great editor. Delane as a newspaper editor is seen at his best in his letters to his associate editor when he was on his travels. He wrote usually after he had gone over the latest issues of the "Times" that had caught up with him, and commented on the literary work and the typographical make-up of the pages, and also offered suggestions as to how this or that subject could best be handled on the editorial page, or who was the best man in the corps of correspondents to be sent specially to cover some coming event of national or international importance. Not even for a week, no matter where he was or how far away from London, did he cease to be editor of the "Times." He never seems to have allowed himself a vacation; for he carried his oversight of the "Times" with him wherever he went. Delane's London house was in Sergeant's Inn, a precinct of the law just off the south side of Fleet Street, and within half a mile of Printing House Square. One of the saddest domestic calamities that can befall a man practically ended his married life. He had, consequently, few of the home ties of the ordinary professional man in middle life; no children of his own to make any calls on his time and care, and for nearly forty years he lived wholly for the "Times."

In the period that lies between the French Revolution and the second Reform Act of 1867, James Perry, who from 1789 to 1817 edited the famous Whig "Morning Chronicle,"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and who among his other newspaper achievements was the organizer of the present corps system of reporting the debates in Parliament, is the only English newspaper editor who can be compared with Delane. Perry's opportunities, in spite of the success of the old "Morning Chronicle" under his editorship, were not nearly so great nor so varied as those of Delane. Enterprise such as Delane developed was not physically possible in the days when there were no railways, no steamships, no telegraph and cable lines, and no presses printing from the roll. Delane belongs to the second era of daily newspaper development in England. He is of the era that preceded the new journalism that has been developed in connection with the present-day half-penny daily newspapers of London—and in this second era, of which he was the pioneer, he must always hold the premier position among great newspaper-makers as a man who not only found opportunity awaiting him, but who was constantly creating new opportunities.

Delane was not a publicist who worked for great causes. He was a free-trader; but he had a contempt for the other movements in which Cobden and Bright were engaged. Political convictions concerning the domestic policy of England lay as lightly on Delane as they did on Melbourne or Palmerston, whose stereotyped reply to political reformers who got near enough to them to urge their causes was, "Can't you leave things alone?" In 1865, when Palmerston died, Delane's prayer was, "May God in His mercy defend the country, for now will begin a real revolution, political, religious and social." In the struggle of 1861-65 all Delane's sympathies were with the Southern States; and he was evidently misled by W. H. Russell's estimate of the position—the estimate that Russell wrote in his first American letter to the "Times," and reprinted in his "Diary, North and South," which was published in book form in December, 1862. "Although," wrote Russell, in the preface to this book, "I have never for one moment seen reason to change the opinion I expressed in the first letter I wrote from the States, that the Union as it was could never be restored, I am satisfied that the Free States of the North will retain and gain great advantages by the struggle if they will only set themselves at work to accomplish their destiny, nor lose time in sighing over vanished empire or indulging in abortive dreams

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of conquest and schemes of vengeance." Delane must have accepted this off-hand and ill-informed judgment of his special correspondent with all seriousness; for on December 25th, 1864, he wrote to Dasent, "The American news is a heavy blow to us as well as to the South. It has changed at once the whole face of things." On December 12th Delane wrote Dasent, "I am still sore vexed about Sherman,"—about Sherman's march through Georgia; "but," he added in this letter to his associate editor, "Chenery did his best to attenuate the mischief," which was Delane's way of commending Chenery's editorial article which broke the news gently to the sympathizers with the South in England that Sherman was soon to be in possession of Savannah and that the Rebellion was at an end.

The value of the political letters in these two volumes is great and distinctive; for they supplement nearly every really important volume of political memoirs and letters which was published in England between the issue of Ashley's "Life of Palmerston" and Theodore Martin's "Life of the Prince Consort" in 1879 and 1880 and Lord Edmund Fitzmaurice's "Life of Earl Granville" and the "Letters of Queen Victoria," which appeared in 1905 and 1907.

EDWARD PORRITT.

"THE STANDARD OF USAGE IN ENGLISH."*

UNDER the ramparts of those who were ignorantly yet valiantly defending our noble English tongue against "corruptions" of all sorts Professor Lounsbury has now exploded a bomb which will bring their bastions tumbling about their ears. Many there be who have entrenched themselves behind a mound of grammars and of other manuals setting forth the secret of "correct" English, and who will now find themselves blown up into the windy spaces of the sky with no haven of refuge in sight. And scores of those rigid reformers who have been hard at work "schoolmastering" the language, marking out metes and bounds beyond which it might not stray, will now discover that their occupation is gone, and also the sole reason for their existence. The battle

* "The Standard of Usage in English." By Thomas R. Lounsbury, Emeritus Professor of English in Yale University. New York and London: Harper & Brothers. 1908. 8vo, pp. 310.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

breeze brings to us faintly the shrieks of the wounded and the groans of the dying—with Mr. Andrew Lang and Mr. Henry Cabot Lodge still to hear from.

In this pleasantly written little book, as unpedantic and as unpedagogic as possible, as full of good-humor as it is of humor, Professor Lounsbury has considered the whole question of good English. What is good English? How do we know whether any word or any locution is proper or improper? What principles ought to govern us in our choice of words and phrases and forms of speech? What authority have those who fiercely denounce the Split-Infinitive and the Retained-Object? Who shall decide when doctors disagree? Where can we find dry ground for the ark of the covenant to rest on? And the answer to all these queries is simplicity itself. The English language has been made, is being made and will be made by those who use it. Constantly is it growing, changing, adjusting itself to new uses, fitting itself more exactly to its ever-shifting needs. It is manufacturing new words; and it is giving new meanings to old words. It is modifying not only its grammar, but also its syntax as it finds occasion. It is always in transformation, as becomes a living thing, since the only languages that have ceased to develop are the dead languages. And all these incessant modifications are the proof of the vitality of English and the necessary evidence of its health.

Many of these innovations shock us at first by their novelty. Some of them repel us as overt barbarisms. A few attract us at once by their felicity. But barbarous or felicitous, they all serve to show that the language is not dead, that it is very much alive, that it is vigorously keeping itself fit for service. They may seem like "corruptions" to those who are alert to defend what they suppose to be the "purity" of the language. It is not from new words or from new turns of phrase that the language is in danger, but from those who wish to impose on it a strait-jacket of logical uniformity, which would hinder it from its full service as an instrument of communication.

What, then, is the test which will ascertain whether a word or a phrase is fit and proper? It is no arbitrary standard evolved from the inner consciousness of self-appointed censors. It is nothing more than usage,—the usage of the great writers of the language. If a locution can be found frequently in the pages of the masters of English, then it is good English, no matter how

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

illogical it may seem or how unwarrantable, no matter what objections may be raised by purists. There can be no other standard than that set up by the practice of the great writers of the language. What they did, we are thereby authorized to do. What they rejected we can employ only at our peril.

Our own likes and dislikes may govern us as individuals, and we may decline ever to write "the two first" or "to loan" or "mutual friend," but our preferences and prejudices do not give us any warrant for asserting that any one of these is "correct" or "incorrect." Here the advice of Professor Lounsbury is pertinent;—"as long as the propriety of the expression remains unsettled, it is well for the peace of mind of the writer, who is sensitive to criticism, to refrain from employing it; but it is equally advisable for him to refrain from proclaiming the employment of it by others as something unpardonable" (p. 112).

What Professor Lounsbury has done in this book, as unpretentious as it is entertaining, is first to lay down this sound doctrine, and then to consider the history of a host of words and phrases and forms of speech which have been ignorantly denounced. He heaps up illustrations to show that the so-called Split-Infinitive,—*e. g.*, "to clearly prove"—has been employed by many of the foremost poets and prose-writers of Great Britain and the United States. We are all of us at liberty to avoid it if we choose, but Macaulay and Tennyson, Matthew Arnold and Lowell all used it unhesitatingly. Professor Lounsbury is particularly effective in exploding the absurdity of saying "would rather" instead of the sturdily idiomatic "had rather." He takes special pleasure in pointing out that the use of "females" for "women"—which is often denounced as a special atrocity of Fenimore Cooper's—was very common in the eighteenth century and in the first half of the nineteenth. Jane Austen, for one, often speaks of herself as a "female."

We are already indebted to Professor Lounsbury for an admirable life of Cooper, for a stimulating history of the English language, and for a richly appreciative critical biography of Chaucer. But perhaps our indebtedness to him is even greater for this book on the "Standard of Usage" and its immediate predecessor on the "Standard of Pronunciation."

BRANDER MATTHEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

LONDON: PARIS: WASHINGTON.

LONDON, *July, 1908.*

THE days when Englishmen were indifferent to and conspicuously ignorant of American politics have happily passed. I do not mean to imply that a subject so vast, so tangled and so remote from their daily concerns very vividly interests them, or that their acquaintance with it is by any means profound. But ten Englishmen of influence and authority now visit "the States" for every one that went there a decade ago; it is a reproach not to have a reasonable working knowledge of the American Constitution and American questions; and the English press has splendidly fostered the desire for Transatlantic news.

There can, at any rate, be no question that the interest displayed by Englishmen in the Republican and Democratic Conventions was very great, that the information published about them in the London journals was abundant enough to satisfy the most ardent inquirer into American politics, and that the comments upon their results showed good sense and a considerable degree of knowledge. To all but a very few Englishmen Mr. Taft is personally unknown; but, from the moment he became a Presidential possibility, his career was fully "written up" and the man in the street has by now a very fair idea both of his personality and of what he has accomplished in the Philippines, in Cuba, at Panama and as the handy man of the Roosevelt Administration.

Unlike Mr. Taft, Mr. Bryan has visited England and has met and spoken with most of the leading journalists and politicians. He went away, I believe, very well pleased with his reception, but probably quite ignorant of the impression he had left behind. It was not a very favorable impression. He is the last type of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man who would be elected to high office in this country, and Englishmen, as a rule, find the idea of him as President of the United States well-nigh inconceivable. As a man of courage, blameless life and character, and of an aspiring but not a self-seeking disposition, he commands their sympathy and to some extent their admiration. There is a feeling, too, in England that he has borne himself manfully under defeat, and that, after blazing the trail for Mr. Roosevelt, he has been unlucky in seeing most of his policies annexed by his opponents. With the social protest which, even in 1896, was the true backbone of Bryanism, a great many Englishmen—practically, indeed, all English Radicals—are in sympathy. But they remember his currency heresies and his vapid attacks upon Imperialism, and they are wholly disconcerted by the levity with which in the last twenty months he has suddenly taken up, and as suddenly dropped, such gigantic issues as the nationalization of the trunk railway lines, the introduction of the initiative and the referendum and the question of a Government guarantee for bank deposits. What it comes to is that, while Englishmen like Mr. Bryan personally, they rate his mental capacities rather low, are wholly sceptical of his powers of statesmanship, regard him pre-eminently as a talker and cannot find any reason to suspect that he possesses any hidden gift for the work of administration.

In domestic affairs, politics during the last few weeks has had to contend with the attractions of a perfect June and of an exceptionally full and brilliant "season." This Government, however, has not yet lost the knack of being interesting. The progress of the Old Age Pensions Bill through Committee, the parades and other demonstrations of the woman suffragists, the fight over the Miners' Eight Hours Bill and the highly "popular" discussion aroused by the Daylight Saving Bill, have furnished, along with a bye-election or two, plenty of material for political debate. As to the Old Age Pensions measure, the inevitable process of enlarging its scope and increasing its expense has already begun. Instead of the $30,000,000 which Mr. Asquith talked about, the country is now informed that $37,500,000 will be the minimum cost of the experiment in its opening year. Many of the safeguards that were included in the original scheme have disappeared. The inquiry into the character of applicants for pensions has been whittled down to a mere formality. A

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sliding scale has been substituted in place of the fixed minimum income of $2.50 a week that was to entitle to a pension. The age limit remains at seventy, but for how long no man dare prophesy. The disqualification of paupers also remains, but it is avowedly provisional; it is not likely to survive the general revision of the Poor Law which is to be the great work of 1909, and its removal, which is one of the certainties of the future, means an addition of at least $20,000,000 a year. The clause under which married couples of seventy and over, if living together, were to receive less than the sum of two full pensions has already been abandoned. The second reading of the measure was carried by an enormous majority, only a handful of the Opposition daring to vote against it. But, except for the Socialists and the Labor party, no man is quite at ease in the depths of his mind; no one can foresee where the financial demands are to end; no one is even able to state with any show of plausibility how, in the face of an inevitable increase in the Navy estimates, Mr. Lloyd George is to find the money for floating the scheme; and no Free Trader, above all, can be sure that Old Age Pensions may not prove the grave of Free Trade.

Since Mr. Asquith undertook to accept an amendment in favor of woman suffrage, in the Electoral Reform Bill which he has promised for next year, provided that the amendment was a "democratic" one and that the majority of men and women approved it, the suffragists have organized two monster demonstrations to convince him that their movement has the support of the sex. One of the first results of their renewed activities, however, has been to rally the women who are opposed to the agitation and who do not wish to be dragged into politics by their more vehement sisters. An Anti-Suffrage League, with many prominent ladies at the head of it, has been formed and will, I think, undoubtedly carry on a vigorous propaganda. But the suffragists, being the more vocal and the more determined, are also, in my judgment, the winning force. I cannot question the ultimate success of their movement; though when and on what conditions their victory will be achieved are beyond my powers of speculation. Mr. Asquith's proviso that the suffrage must be "on a democratic basis" was designedly cryptic, but practical politicians interpret it as meaning that all women over twenty-one who can qualify as householders are to receive the vote. To

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

admit to the Parliamentary franchise merely those women who have property of their own would be to make a free gift to the forces of Conservatism—an object for which Liberals, naturally enough, feel no enthusiasm. It is probable, therefore, that to be acceptable to the Government the amendment, in addition to including all women with property in their own right, would also place on the register all married women whose husbands were already entitled to vote. This could be done by making the wife a joint householder, for electoral purposes, with her husband; but whether the Lords will agree to so vast an extension of the suffrage, and what will happen if they refuse, are points of very great uncertainty. Nor is it possible to do more than surmise the opinions either of the majority of men or of the majority of women on the whole question. The main reason for believing that woman suffrage in England is only a question of time rests, after all, on the conviction that politicians on the hunt for votes can be badgered into anything.

A measure which has not shown the Government to the best advantage is the Miners' Eight Hours Bill—a Bill for restricting the average time of employment for miners below ground to eight hours a day, with a maximum of sixty hours' overtime *per annum*. The Bill has been hotly attacked, and the fear of dear coal which it has imprinted on the mind of the average man was undoubtedly a powerful factor in the recent bye-elections. How far that fear is justified, it is impossible, in the face of so much conflicting evidence, for an outsider to determine. The mine-owners and the heads of many industries, in which coal plays a vital part, have estimated that the Bill, if it becomes law, will reduce the output of coal by twenty-six million tons a year, and will throw upon the consumer an extra burden of anywhere from $100,000,000 to $500,000,000 *per annum*. These figures, I need hardly say, are keenly challenged, but the select committee which inquired into the whole subject reported that the establishment of a fixed eight-hours day, whether at a stroke or gradually, "cannot but result in a temporary contraction of output and a consequent period of embarrassment and loss to the country at large." The Government has been so far influenced by this Report as to defer for five years the final introduction of the eight-hours system. But the concession has merely lost them a few friends without winning over any enemies; and there can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hardly, I think, be much doubt that the general public views the measure with extreme disfavor. Coal is the basis of Great Britain's industrial position. In many of her largest industries, in iron, steel and shipping, the cost of coal represents from forty to fifty per cent. of the cost of production and maintenance. Anything, therefore, that artificially reduces the output or raises the price of coal is bound to make its influence felt, not only in every household, but through all branches of British trade. The struggle, it is pointed out, is not one between miners and mine-owners, but between the mining industry and the nation. All the old arguments that have done duty a hundred times before to prove the iniquity of Governmental interference with adult labor are being trotted out again, and still, I dare say, find people to believe in them. But even those who disbelieve in them may well feel puzzled to decide on the merits of this particular measure. The balance of its advantages and its disadvantages is very even. Except among the Labor men (who are by no means unanimous in its support), it finds no really hearty backers, while its enemies are legion. From the party standpoint I imagine that most Liberals would be well pleased to see it done to death in the Lords. They fear its passage, and they well might. No Government in the world would willingly appeal to the country at a time when its legislation had sent up the price of so indispensable a requisite in the home and in the factory as coal.

PARIS, *July, 1908.*

IT is not often that the present writer can advert to three important questions which have just come to what may safely be called their conclusions. But this is actually his privilege today, for the nationalization of the Western Railway, the recall of the French troops from Morocco and the final and complete separation of Church and State can be looked upon as history.

The success of the Bill for the nationalization of the Western Railway is a curious paradox: it must be described as nothing less than a victory of M. Clémenceau over his friends, thanks to the assistance of his enemies. On taking office M. Clémenceau had declared that he intended to devote his energies to the accomplishment of three reforms, one of which was the nationalization of the Western Railway, and the other two an Income Tax and an Old Age Pension Fund. Apart from their intrinsic

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merits, these reforms were made necessary at that time, on the one hand, by the feeling of distaste caused by the crude anti-clericalism of M. Combes, and, on the other, by the expediency of mollifying the Socialists by borrowing something of their own programme instead of turning them into desperate enemies.

The announcement of the nationalization of the Western Railway was well received in the country. This was, no doubt, another breach of a solemn contract, as the railways are not to be made over to the State before ninety-nine years from their establishment; but the Western Railway had long been threatened with legal dispossession, and the many Americans who have experienced its deficiencies on most of the lines starting from the Montparnasse and Saint-Lazare stations will not marvel at the popular hostility against it.

The Bill was passed through the Chamber, as the most difficult Bills generally are, with amazing rapidity. In such cases the Deputies always trust that the Cabinet will be overthrown and a new Bill brought in, or that the Senate will undertake to make any modifications that may be needed. In fact, the Senate, though strongly in favor of the Premier, evinced from the first quite an exceptional dislike to the idea. The French Senate, though far more numerous and of considerably less influence and power than the corresponding body at Washington, is superior to the Chamber, and consists of men, as a rule, comparatively independent. But, for this very reason, they are likely to be antagonistic to any measure looking like an attack on private property. Not only was the Committee appointed to examine the Bill as sent up from the Chamber almost unanimously opposed to it, but all the Senators suspected of being favorable to it were excluded from the Budget Committee, which is regarded as the most important one. Even M. Léon Bourgeois, who could have been President of the Senate if he had so chosen, was not spared the slight. So it appeared almost immediately that there would be more or less open warfare between the Government and the Senate on this subject.

The reproach of a Socialistic tendency was never made very seriously against the authors of the Bill; the mismanagement of the Company was too evident for that. But the Chairman of the Committee, M. Prevet, insisted all the time that the Government was laying, under pretence of righting a hopeless

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

situation, an enormous burden on the national finances. In fact, it appears from calculations which have never been seriously contradicted that the yearly expenditure for keeping the railway in proper working order will be at least four million dollars, exclusive of numberless legal cases in which the Government is not, by any means, sure of getting the better of its opponents. The Minister of Public Works, M. Barthou, always contented himself with saying that the state of affairs was getting worse every day for the passengers in the Western trains, that the only remedy was nationalization and that the same step had had been taken in Germany, Belgium and Italy, without any detriment to the State, and without any suspicion of Socialism. Meanwhile, the Committee, hearing of certain private documents necessary to their investigation, applied for them to the Minister, but in vain; and the refusal produced a state of irritation which bordered on resentment when the *discussion générale* — corresponding to committee work in Washington and London—began in the Senate.

The advantage lay throughout with M. Prevet against M. Barthou, who seemed to be supported only by a very few benches at the Extreme Left, and when this preparatory debate was drawing near its close (a vote on the advisability of discussing the various clauses of the Bill), a casual observer would have had no hesitation in predicting a total defeat of the Cabinet, the more so as some officious Senators were endeavoring to ward off the catastrophe by bringing about fresh negotiations between the Government and the Company.

However, considerations other than economical were to carry the most weight, M. Clémenceau, who had never spoken a word in the Senate, openly said that he was sure of a majority of twenty-five votes, and his calculation proved correct. The Senate certainly hated the idea of dispossession by the State of a large company, but they dreaded much more the dispossession by M. Combes of the first Cabinet that ever was able to withstand the efforts of the Socialists. The reader may remember what I said in a previous letter of a conspiracy, exclusively and miserably political, between M. Combes and M. Jaurès, to repair the old *Bloc*. But the restoration of the *Bloc* means nothing if not the Socialist hegemony, a few years of which were almost sufficient to ruin the army and navy, and leave France helpless in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hands of the Confederacy of Labor. Even the dullest politician, outside the Socialist group and the crew of malcontents headed by M. Combes, realizes that Clémenceau has lifted France out of a most dangerous situation, and it requires the blind vanity of the Radical-Socialists to imagine that government is possible with the concurrence of Jaurès. The practical sense of the landowners, manufacturers and lawyers in the Senate places them above all danger of such a delusion. In spite of appearances, they were consequently resolved to keep Clémenceau in office even at the cost of their pride.

The day before the division a scene took place in the Senate which nobody, only three years ago, could have thought possible. M. Rouvier, the ex-Premier, the only French politician comparable to Clémenceau for lucidity of mind and spirit, actually besought him in pathetic language to desist from a resolution that would only humiliate the Parliament and make them feel as if they were trembling under another Louis XIV. Clémenceau was inexorable, and treated his colleagues of yesterday not as an absolute monarch, but as a strong man will treat trembling children whose safety depends on his presence. He good humoredly told them that he could not unsay what he had said on taking office, and that he could not be content with playing forever the *rôle* of a gendarme. The measure taken against the Western Railway was reasonable, and the Senate had the choice between passing it and looking for another Cabinet.

The division took place at once amidst the greatest agitation, and resulted in a majority of three for the Cabinet, the three votes undoubtedly of the Ministers present. This was a narrow escape; but, as usual in such occurrences, the majority rose immediately to twenty, then to thirty and finally to thirty-eight; and seventeen Senators who had not dared vote at all in the first division came penitently to explain, amidst general laughter, that they could not understand how their names had been omitted, considering that they had always been favorable to the Bill. This was the farcical *dénouement* of what had nearly been a tragedy, the President of the Senate promising most seriously to set an inquiry on foot and leave no stone unturned to know what had become of the vanished tickets.

A few days before this memorable sitting, the Foreign Minister had declared to the Chamber that General d'Amade had received

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

orders to bring his troops back to Casablanca. The announcement was received with great applause by the Socialists, but with astonishment by everybody else. No recent event had led to an anticipation of such a decision, and everything had seemed contrary to it. The Premier had closeted himself for two days, some weeks ago, with General Lyautey, and the latter on his return to Algeria had behaved as if he had been given *carte blanche,* while General d'Amade pursued a more and more energetic action in the Chaouïa. The almost unbroken success of the troops under this General, after the temporizing campaign of his predecessor, General Drude, had given confidence to the country. There was no protest when the Foreign Minister or M. Clémenceau laughed to scorn the ominous utterances of M. Jaurès: the Chamber had grown quite used to the idea of war. Certainly, M. Ribot and the "*Journal des Débats*" would still occasionally point out possible dangers; but the press, as a rule, had adopted a warlike tone which it had long unlearned. The "*Temps,*" more especially, published several articles during the President's visit to King Edward, which simply viewed the war with Germany and the weight of the *entente cordiale* as if a quarrel had been a certainty. One of the best-known writers in the same paper, M. Tardieu, said that during a recent visit to the United States he had become convinced that the spirited action of General d'Amade in Morocco had done more than all the alliances and agrements and *ententes* to modify the notion held by many Americans that France was on the down grade to decay, and the public seemed to adopt the same view. In short, the Moroccan war had so completely ceased to be a bugbear that it was looked upon, in all quarters, rather as a national tonic. There was, therefore, blank disappointment when the official despatches to General d'Amade were read to the Chamber, and many people have not yet recovered from the feeling.

The motives of M. Clémenceau for changing thus abruptly a policy which had been identified with his name are not clearly apparent; the Chaouïa district has certainly been restored to order, and the marauders who swarmed all over that region, after the Casablanca massacre, will not easily forget the punishment they have received; but tranquillity is far from being secured in the rest of the Empire. Who can tell what the consequences of Moulay-Hafid's inevitable victory over his brother

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will be? There would be some prospect of tranquillity really prevailing in Morocco, on the lines of the Algeciras Act, if the Sultan, in whose behalf the Conference took place, were the real sovereign; but he is not, and, to all intents and purposes, the Sultan is Moulay-Hafid—that is to say, a creature and, possibly to-morrow, an agent of Germany.

There may be secret reasons for abandoning Morocco just when every apparent motive seems to point the other way. It may be, also, that M. Clémenceau is, after all, averse to a colonial policy, and,—as M. Cochin told him rather bitterly,—repeats in Morocco what he once did in Egypt. He has energy, decision and intrepidity; but in spite of his dare-devil ways, there is nothing venturesome in his nature. When he has carefully weighed all motives and consequences, he is never daunted from his purpose, and carries his decision through smilingly, but he must have seen clearly what the consequences are likely to be. This is firmness, not audacity. The Premier is more of a Parisian than of a Frenchman. The old French spirit of enterprise is replaced in him by a sober sense of what is possible and what is not, and his recklessness is confined within those limits. It should be added that since 1870 this disposition has been in perfect keeping with the national temper.

Of Church affairs there has been little to be said lately, as all that might be worth noticing is more preparation for a future which does not seem very near than actual occurrences. But we can now record the epilogue of the difficult process known as the Separation of Church and State.

This momentous step was,—it will be remembered,—initiated by the State less under the pressure of facts than under the influence of one of those logical fallacies to which the French mind is wonderfully prone. It seemed to be an admirable policy in the State to ignore the Church, as if such an attitude had not been utterly impossible even in the case of communities much less important than the Roman Church. The difficulty appeared at once when the first Separation Law was debated in 1905. The then Minister of Worship, M. Briand, was soon brought to seek a neutral ground in the constitution of the famous Cultural Associations, the lay members of which were to be the connecting link between the clergy and Government. This arrangement Rome rejected as ignoring the rights of the hierarchy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The immediate consequence was the confiscation of all Church property and the appropriation by all the municipalities of the places of public worship. However, these places having to remain exclusively dedicated to their original purpose, some sort of agreement was to intervene between the parish boards and the local clergy. M. Briand suggested a yearly declaration to the mayor, but this again fell through, partly through the fault of the Government, but to the evident satisfaction of Rome, and the legal status of the Church of France remained a problem. The solution, or at least the first elements of a possible solution, seemed to have been found some weeks ago on the occasion of a debate on the devolution of the position of Church property that was invested in stock. Five million dollars of this belonged to Funds for the Aged Clergy, but were going, like the rest, to be made over to municipal charities, when the Abbé Lemire succeeded in impressing the Chamber with a sense of the enormity of such a confiscation, and proposed that the sum in question should be lodged with Mutual Assistance Societies, whereupon a Protestant Senator, M. Berger, suggested in his turn that the sums bequeathed to the churches towards religious services for the dead should also be rescued from the general disaster and handed over to the same Societies. Both amendments were passed, and there was a feeling in the country not only that had a piece of iniquity been avoided, but that there was a chance of coming to further arrangements on the same basis. Among the French clergy who have had no chance of being more than passive between Rome and the French Government the satisfaction was unmixed; and the disappointment was great — in spite of the immediate adhesion of all the Bishops—when Rome forbade any steps on the part of the clerical Societies of Assistance to claim back the property offered to them.

Into the motives or, I should say, causes of the Pope's decision this is not the place to enter. Suffice it to say that it was only welcomed with unmitigated joy by men—oftener lay than clerical—who look upon religious fights as promoting political views which have, in fact, nothing to do with religion. It is a cruel truth that the Church of France is as ill served by some of her so-called friends as by her enemies. For the present she is like a nondescript in the country, and her future is by no means clear.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WASHINGTON, *July, 1908.*

ALMOST the whole of the week ending July 11th was spent in Denver, Colorado, by the Democratic National Convention in formulating a platform and designating nominees, whereas, as a matter of fact, all its business might have been transacted within twelve hours in Mr. Bryan's house near Lincoln, Nebraska. As the event showed, the nomination of Mr. Bryan for the Presidency by a majority of more than two-thirds of the delegates was assured unalterably before the Convention was opened, and, subsequently, not a contestant was seated, nor was a single plank fixed definitely in the platform, without Mr. Bryan's approval. Never in our political history has a body, nominally representative, been dominated so absolutely by one man. The Republican National Convention, which met in June in Chicago, was accused of being a mere machine, of which President Roosevelt was the engineer, every movement being dictated from the White House. The truth is that the anti-Roosevelt wing of the Republican party, piloted by Speaker Cannon, succeeded in thwarting a part of Mr. Roosevelt's intentions, so far as the platform of his party was concerned, and in choosing a nominee for the Vice-Presidency whom it is hard to believe that Mr. Roosevelt can have desired. By contrast with the slavish subservience evinced at Denver to the will of an autocrat, the Chicago Convention was an impressive example of freedom of speech and action on the part of the freely chosen spokesmen of a part of a free people. It is true that, in dealing with contesting delegations, the Committee on Credentials at Chicago was charged with employing a steam-roller, but nothing done at Chicago was comparable for cynical defiance of justice with the treatment at Denver of the McCarren delegates from Brooklyn and the Guffey delegates from Philadelphia. It was shrewdly said by an onlooker that the acts and declarations of the Denver Convention are invested with no moral authority, because they reflected nothing except the supposed self-interest and individual determination of an unscrupulous boss.

Of the candidate for the Presidency put forward at Denver nothing can now be said which has not been said repeatedly during the last twelve years. Mr. Bryan is not a Democrat. He is a Populist, or, in other words, a Socialist, so far as he thinks it prudent to carry Socialism at this time. Could he have had his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way in 1896 we should have had the free coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one, and he still advocated the same ruinous measure in 1900. Mr. Bryan also demanded twelve years ago that the power to issue notes to circulate as money should be taken from the national banks, and that all paper money should be issued directly by the Treasury Department, and receivable for all debts, public and private. In effect, this demand was obviously one for unlimited greenbacks, and was taken bodily from the Populist platform. In 1896, he did not blush to advocate the packing of the United States Supreme Court in order to secure a reversal by that tribunal of its decision against an income tax. In 1896, Mr. Bryan vigorously supported the sweeping attack on the Federal judiciary which was embodied in the pseudo-Democratic platform of that year. That, at heart, he wishes to go much farther in a Socialist direction than, as yet, his partisans are willing to accompany him is evident from the fact that, on several occasions during the last three years, he has urged the national ownership of railways. The facts here cited suffice to justify the assertion that a party willing to nominate a third time for the Presidency a man identified with the doctrines named has forfeited the right to call itself Democratic.

As for the nominee for the Vice-Presidency, Mr. John W. Kern of Indiana, his nomination was notoriously dictated by Mr. Bryan with exclusive reference to the campaign in Indiana. That he is not a man possessing the courage of his convictions is manifest, because, in 1896, although a believer in the gold standard, and opposed as a lawyer to any crippling of the equity powers of the Federal Courts, he gave his support to Mr. Bryan and the Chicago platform of that year. Touching the help that he is likely to give his ticket in the State of which he is a resident, we merely note that, when he ran for Governor in 1900, he was beaten by 25,000 votes, and four years later, when again a candidate for the same office, by about 85,000.

As for the platform put forth at Denver, we can best indicate the view which reasonable citizens are likely to take of it by comparing it with the platform on which Mr. Taft is standing. With regard to the revision of the tariff, the Denver platform is much more restrained than was that fashioned at Chicago in 1892, and much less sharply distinguished from the Republican programme, which itself declares unequivocally for a revision

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the tariff at a special session of Congress to follow immediately the inauguration of the next President. The Denver platform, however, would place upon the free list all foreign articles competing with American products controlled by trusts; whereas the Republican programme asserts that, in all tariff legislation, the true principle of protection is best maintained by the imposition of such duties as will equal the difference between the cost of production at home and the cost of producing similar articles abroad. Under all the circumstances, it is improbable that tariff revision will play a conspicuous part in the coming contest at the ballot-box. The difference between the two platforms, as regards their respective attitude towards Federal Courts and the issue of injunctions, is less marked than it was in 1896. The Republican party declared this year at Chicago that it would at all times uphold the authority and integrity of the Federal Courts, and would ever insist that their powers to enforce their process and to protect life, liberty and property shall be preserved inviolate. The belief, however, was expressed in June last at Chicago that the rules of procedure in the Federal Courts with respect to the issuance of the writ of injunction should be more accurately defined by statute, and that no injunction or temporary restraining order should be issued without notice, except where irreparable injury would result from delay, in which case a speedy hearing thereafter should be granted. The Denver platform also professes to regard the Courts of justice as the bulwark of our liberties, and declares that "we yield to none in our purpose to maintain their dignity." It is pronounced "an unjust reflection upon a great body of our citizens to assume that they lack respect for the Courts." Nevertheless, the delegates to Denver aver that experience has proved the necessity of a modification of the present law relating to injunctions, and proclaim themselves in favor of a measure which passed the United States Senate in 1896, and which provided for trial by jury in cases of indirect contempt. There is no doubt that the authority of a Court of Equity would be seriously crippled if a person guilty of indirect contempt (by which is meant a person not in the actual presence of a Court) had a right to claim a trial by jury. It is very questionable whether such an attempt to limit the power of a Court of Equity to uphold its orders would not be pronounced unconstitutional.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now let us mark what the two platforms say about trusts and corporations. The Chicago platform recalls the fact that the Republican party passed the Sherman anti-trust law over Democratic opposition, and enforced it after Democratic dereliction. According to the Chicago platform, however, experience has shown that the effectiveness of the Sherman anti-trust law can be increased by such amendments as will give to the Federal Government greater supervision and control over those corporations engaged in interstate commerce which have power and opportunity to create monopolies. The Denver programme, on its part, favors rigorous enforcement of the criminal law against guilty trust magnates and officials, and demands the enactment of such additional legislation as shall make it impossible for a private monopoly to exist in the United States. Among the new remedies specified at Denver are a law forbidding the duplication of directors among competing corporations; a Federal license for corporations controlling twenty-five per cent. of any product; a prohibition of any corporation's controlling more than fifty per cent. of a given product; and the enforcement of equality of prices in all parts of the country, with allowance for the cost of transportation. It is obvious that the Federal license proposal, if accepted, would invest a President with still more power than he now possesses, power that might be wielded for political effect. With reference to the regulation of railroads, we observe that the Republican platform would amend the interstate commerce law so as to give railroads the right to make and publish traffic agreements, subject to the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission, though maintaining always the principle of competition between lines naturally competing. The Denver platform, on the other hand, gives the Interstate Commerce Commission what it does not now possess, to wit, the initiative in actions against companies without waiting for complaints. Touching this proposal, it has been pointed out that to give the Interstate Commerce Commissioners, who are appointees of the Chief Magistrate, power to reduce rates where no complaint has been made by shippers, is to invite the President to order such reductions solely for political effect. Such a power can safely be entrusted to no Executive while the Government of the United States continues to be a football of party politics.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Among the planks which are similar in both platforms may be mentioned postal savings-banks; the improvement of inland waterways; the endorsement of the civil service system; separate Statehood for New Mexico and Arizona; the better protection of the public health; better roads, and a strong navy. The Denver Convention, however, failed to urge the following demands, which were included in the Republican programme, namely, free rural mail delivery for farmers everywhere, the endorsement of international arbitration and a centennial celebration of Lincoln's birth next year. The Denver Convention also omitted to express confidence in a revival of business, or a hope that Cuba would soon be able to resume her sovereignty. A careful comparison of the more important planks here defined is likely to arouse in the thoughtful reader a feeling of wonder whether the delegates to Denver really believed that further threats would re-establish confidence and credit, reopen factories, fill empty freight-cars, and restore wages to the multitude of the unemployed.

If, now, we are asked what likelihood of success has the ticket framed at Denver, we answer that hopelessness was self-confessed when Mr. John W. Kern was selected as the nominee for the Vice-Presidency. If Judge George Gray of Delaware, or ex-Governor Douglas of Massachusetts, or President Woodrow Wilson of Princeton University, New Jersey, could have been prevailed upon to accept the nomination for that office, the ticket made at Denver might have had some prospect of victory in the Eastern States. As things are, Mr. Bryan must win in the Middle West, if anywhere; and his chance of triumph in Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Ohio and even Indiana must be admitted to be desperate.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

The Esperanto Congress at Dresden.

On the 16th of August the Esperantists of the world will again unite in Congress to celebrate another year's progress of Esperanto and to organize for another year's campaign in both hemispheres. The movement is quite obviously a very vital one, for it keeps constantly adding to its numbers. Thousands of men and women became Esperantists after the Congress of last year held at Cambridge, England. Britain, the conservative, saw fifteen hundred people gathered in one of its own old cities who spoke nothing but this strange new musical tongue—and Britain was impressed with the phenomenon. Hundreds of Englishmen joined the Esperantists after that.

This year the Congress at Dresden, in Germany, will probably be even more fruitful of results. The academic spirit of exclusion is indeed strong in the Kaiser's Empire, but, on the other hand, progress, particularly in commerce, industry and science, is virtually the watchword of Germany; and to progress in these domains Esperanto can be, and in a measure already is, of tremendous assistance. Once the language is brought home to Germany at large by such a gathering as a universal Congress, Germany will without doubt make the most of it.

In its more ideal phases the approaching Congress is already an international benefit. Every one knows of the animosity that still exists between France and Germany. Now, it so happens that France generally sends the most enthusiastic as well as the most numerous delegations to the Esperanto Congresses. The coming of hundreds of Frenchmen and Frenchwomen across the Rhine and their association with German *samideanoj* in a friendly, neutral language will do much to soften remaining asperities.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW will be represented at the Dresden Congress as usual and we trust that as many members as possible of the Esperanto Society organized by the REVIEW will be present at the Dresden Congress and will arrange to meet there. Notice of place and date will be posted on the general bulletin board.

As we go to press Esperantists from every part of our American continent are gathering at Chautauqua to hold the first Esperanto Convention ever held on American soil. The Convention is to last a week, and is provided with an excellent programme of lectures and speeches. That is a splendid sign; it shows that in America also the spirit of Esperanto is alive and the need felt. The time, we believe, is at hand when a universal Congress should be held in this country. Once the facility and the usefulness of Esperanto are brought home to us, Esperanto is sure to advance here even more rapidly than it has advanced in Europe. This REVIEW will do all in its power to assure our European Esperantist friends of a welcome on this side of the Atlantic, should they consent to come next summer, and to make their visit an unqualified success.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LA SENTENCOJ DE SALOMONO.*

(El la Biblio.)

EL LA ORIGINALO TRADUKIS, L. L. ZAMENHOF.

ĈAPITRO XX.

(1) La vino estas blasfemanto, ebriiga trinkaĵo estas sovaĝa, kaj kiu delogiĝas per ili, tiu ne estas prudenta. (2) Minaco de reĝo estas kiel kriego de leono; kiu lin kolerigas, tiu pekas kontraŭ sia vivo. (3) Estas honoro por homo ĉesigi malpacon; sed ĉiu malsaĝulo estas malpacema. (4) En la malvarma tempo mallaborulo ne plugas; li petos en somero, kaj li nenion ricevos. (5) Intenco en la koro de homo estas profunda akvo, sed homo saĝa ĝin elĉerpos. (6) Multaj homoj parolas pri sia boneco, sed kiu trovos homon fidelan? (7) Virtulo iras en sia senpekeco; feliĉaj estas liaj infanoj post li. (8) Reĝo, kiu sidas sur trono de juĝo, dispelas per siaj okuloj ĉion malbonan. (9) Kiu povas diri: "Mi purigis mian koron, mi estas libera de mia peko?" (10) Neegalaj peziloj, neegalaj mezuroj, ambaŭ estas abomenaĵo por Dio. (11) Eĉ knabon oni povas ekkoni laŭ liaj faroj, ĉu estas pura kaj justa lia konduto. (12) Orelon aŭdantan kaj okulon vidantan—ilin ambaŭ kreis Dio. (13) Ne amu dormon, por ke vi ne malriĉiĝu; malfermu viajn okulojn, kaj vi satiĝos de pano. (14) "Malbona, malbona," diras la aĉetanto; sed kiam li foriris, tiam li fanfaronas. (15) Oni povas havi oron kaj multe da perloj, sed saĝa buŝo estas multevalora ilo. (16) Prenu lian veston, ĉar li garantiis por aliulo, kaj pro la fremduloj prenu

* Dr. Zamenhof has made this translation of Proverbs from the original text especially for THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. The first chapter appeared in the December, 1907, issue. The subsequent chapters will be published during 1908.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

de li garantiaĵon. (17) Malhonesta pano estas bongusta por homo, sed lia buŝo poste estas plena de ŝtonetoj. (18) Intencoj fortikiĝas per konsilo, kaj militon oni faru prudente. (19) Kiu malkaŝas sekreton, estas kiel kalumnianto; ne komunikiĝu kun tiu, kiu havas larĝan buŝon. (20) Kiu malbenas sian patron kaj patrinon, ties lumilo estingiĝos meze de profunda mallumo. (21) Heredo, al kiu oni komence tro rapidas, ne estas benata en sia fino. (22) Ne diru: "Mi repagos malbonon"; fidu Dion, kaj Li vin helpos. (23) Neegalaj peziloj estaŝ abomenaĵo por Dio, kaj malvera pesilo estas ne bona. (24) La irado de homo dependas de Dio; kiel homo povus kompreni sian vojon? (25) Ĝi estas reto por homo, se li rapidas kun io sankta kaj post faro de promeso li esploras. (26) Saĝa reĝo dispelas malvirtulojn kaj venigas radon sur ilin. (27) La animo de homo estas lumilo de Dio, ĝi esploras ĉiujn internaĵojn de la korpo. (28) Favorkoreco kaj veremeco gardas reĝon, kaj per favorkoreco li subtenas sian tronon. (29) Gloro por junuloj estas ilia forto, kaj ornamo por maljunuloj estas grizeco. (30) Vundoj de batoj devas penetri en malbonulon, kaj frapoj devas iri profunde en lian korpon.

ĈAPITRO XXI.

(1) Kiel akvaj torentoj estas la koro de reĝo en la mano de Dio: kien Li volas, Li ĝin direktas. (2) Ĉiuj vojoj de homo estas ĝustaj en liaj okuloj, sed Dio pesas la korojn. (3) Plenumado de vero kaj justeco estas al Dio pli agrabla, ol oferado. (4) Fieraj okuloj kaj aroganta koro, lumilo de malvirtuloj, estas peko. (5) La entreprenoj de diligentulo donas nur profiton, sed ĉiu trorapidado kondukas nur al manko. (6) Akirado de trezoroj per lango mansogema estas vanta bloveto de serĉantoj de morto. (7) La rabo de malvirtuloj atakos ilin men, ĉar ili ne volis fari justaĵon. (8) Malrekta estas la vojo de homo kulpa, sed la agado de purulo estas ĝusta. (9) Pli bone estas loĝi sur angulo de tegmento, ol kun malpacema edzino en komuna domo. (10) La animo de malvirtulo deziras malbonon; lia proksimulo ne estas favorata de li. (11) Kiam blasfemanto estas punata, senspertulo fariĝas pli saĝa; kaj kiam oni instruas saĝulon, li akiras prudenton. (12) Virtulo tenas sin prudente rilate la domon de malvirtulo, kaj li faligas malvirtulojn en malbonon. (13) Se iu ŝtopas sian orelon kontraŭ kriado de malriĉulo, li ankaŭ vokos kaj ne estos aŭskultata. (14) Sekreta donaco

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

kvietigas koleron, kaj donaco en la baskon — fortan furiozon. (15) Farado de justaĵo estas ĝojo por la virtulo kaj teruro por la malbonaguloj. (16) Homo, kiu erarforiĝis de la vojo de prudento, eklogos en komunumo de inferuloj. (17) Kiu amas gajecon, tiu havos mankon; kiu amas vinon kaj oleon, ne estos riĉa. (18) La malvirtulo estos liberiga anstataŭo por la virtulo, kaj malpiulo por piuloj. (19) Pli bone estas loĝi en lando dezerta, ol kun malpacema kaj kolerema edzino. (20) Ĉarma trezoro kaj oleo estas en la domo de saĝulo, sed homo malsaĝa ĉion englutas. (21) Kiu celas justecon kaj bonecon, tiu trovos vivon, justecon kaj honoron. (22) Kontraŭ urbo de fortuloj eliras saĝulo, kaj li faligas ĝian fortan fortikaĵon. (23) Kiu gardas sian buŝon kaj sian langon, tiu gardas sian animon kontraŭ malfeliĉoj. (24) Fiera malbonulo, kiun oni nomas blasfemulo, agas kun kolero kaj malboneco. (25) La deziro de mallaborulo lin mortigas, ĉar liaj manoj ne volas labori. (26) Ĉiuage li forte deziras; sed virtulo donas kaj ne rifuzas. (27) Oferdono de malvirtuloj estas abomenaĵo, ĉar kun malico ĝi estas alportata. (28) Mensoga atestanto pereos, sed homo, kiu mem aŭdis, ĉiam parolos. (29) Malvirtulo tenas sian vizaĝon arogante, sed virtulo fortikigas sian vojon. (30) Ne ekzistas saĝo, ne ekzistas prudento, ne ekzistas konsilo kontraŭ Dio. (31) Ĉevalo estas preparata por la tago de milito, sed la helpo venas de Dio.

ĈAPITRO XXII.

(1) Nomo estas pli bona, ol granda riĉeco, kaj bona estimo estas pli bona, ol arĝento kaj oro. (2) Riĉulo kaj malriĉulo renkontiĝas, ilin ambaŭ kreis Dio. (3) Prudentulo vidas malbonon kaj kaŝiĝas, sed malsaĝuloj iras kaj difektiĝas. (4) Por humileco kaj timo antaŭ Dio oni ricevas riĉecon kaj honoron kaj vivon. (5) Dornoj kaj retoj estas sur la vojo de malbonagulo; kiu gardas sian animon, tiu malproksimiĝas de ili. (6) Instruu knabon en la komenco de lia vojo, kaj eĉ maljuniĝinte li ne dekliniĝos de ĝi. (7) Riĉulo regas super malriĉuloj, kaj kiu prunteprenas, tiu estas sklavo de la pruntedoninto. (8) Kiu semas maljustaĵon, tiu rikoltos suferon, kaj la kano de lia krueleco rompiĝos. (9) Bonokululo estos benata, ĉar li donas el sia pano al malriĉulo. (10) Forpelu blasfemulon, kaj foriros malpaco, kaj ĉesos malkonsento kaj ofendo. (11) Kiu amas purecon de koro kaj agrable parolas, al tiu la reĝo estas amiko.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(12) La okuloj de Dio gardas la prudenton, sed la vortojn de maliculo li renversas. (13) Mallaborulo diras: "Leono estas ekstere, mi povus esti mortigita meze de la strato." (14) La buŝo de malĉastulino estas profunda foso; kiun Dio koleras, tiu tien enfalas. (15) Malsaĝeco forte sidas en la koro de knabo, sed vergo punanta ĝin elpelas el ĝi. (16) Kiu premas malriĉulon, por pligrandigi sian riĉecon, tiu donas al riĉulo, por ke li malriĉiĝu. (17) Klinu vian orelon kaj aŭskultu vortojn de saĝuloj, kaj direktu vian koron al mia instruo. (18) Ĉar ili estos agrablaj, se vi gardos ilin en via interno, ili estos ĉiuj pretaj sur viaj lipoj. (19) Ke al Dio estu via fido, tion mi instruis al vi hodiaŭ. (20) Ĉu mi ne skribis al vi tion trifoje kun konsiloj kaj scio. (21) Por sciigi al vi la ĝustecon de la paroloj de vero, por ke vi transdonu la parolojn de vero al tiuj, kiuj vin sendis? (22) Ne prirabu malriĉulon, pro tio, ke li estas malriĉa, kaj ne premu senhavulon ĉe la pordego. (23) Ĉar Dio defendos ilian aferon kaj dispremos iliajn premantojn. (24) Ne amikiĝu kun homo kolerema, kaj ne komunikiĝu kun homo flamiĝema, (25) ke vi ne lernu lian vojon kaj ne ricevu reton por via animo. (26) Ne estu inter tiuj, kiuj firmigas per mano, kiuj garantias por ŝuldoj. (27) Se vi ne havos per kio pagi, oni ja prenos vian litaĵon de sub vi. (28) Ne forŝovu la antikvajn limojn, kiujn faris viaj patroj. (29) Se vi vidas homon lertan en sia profesio, li staros antaŭ reĝoj, li ne staros antaŭ maleminentuloj.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER.

HENRY WADE ROGERS,

Dean of the Law Department of Yale University, was graduated from the University of Michigan in 1874. He was admitted to the bar in 1877. In 1883 he was appointed Professor of Law in the Law School of the University of Michigan, of which he was Dean from 1885 to 1890. He was president of the Northwestern University from 1890 to 1901, when he was appointed Professor of Law in Yale University. He is the author of a number of standard works on legal subjects, including a treatise on "Expert Testimony."

COLONEL CHARLES W. LARNED, U.S.A.,

graduated at West Point in 1870. He forthwith joined the Third Cavalry as second lieutenant, was shortly transferred to the Seventh Cavalry, and was engaged in reconstruction duty with his regiment in the South from 1871 to 1873. He was a member of the Stanley expedition against the Sioux Indians, and took part in the engagement of the Big Horn River in 1873. Since 1876 he has been Professor of Technical and Military Graphics and Applied Geometry at West Point. He is the author of a work entitled "The Great Discourse," and a frequent contributor to magazines on artistic, military and religious subjects.

ARCHIBALD HENDERSON

is a graduate of the University of North Carolina, and holds the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from the same institution. He has been a tutor and Fellow in the University of Chicago, and now he is associate professor of mathematics at his Alma Mater. He has published a number of articles, particularly on modern dramatic subjects, in many magazines, both American and foreign.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

W. S. Rossiter,

after graduating from Amherst College in 1884, filled a position in the business department of "The New York Tribune," and, later, of "The New York Press." Subsequently, he established a printing and publishing business on his own account, and in 1900 he was called to Washington to take charge of the publication of the reports of the Twelfth Census, and also to prepare the Twelfth Census report on printing and publishing. In 1904 he was appointed Chief Clerk of the Census, and he has since occupied that position, retaining also the supervision of the printing of the Census Bureau. He is the author of a volume of short stories and of various statistical papers and magazine articles.

Henry White

graduated at one of the public schools of New York City, and adopted the trade of clothing-cutting. At the age of eighteen he joined the Knights of Labor. In 1891 he founded the United Garment Workers of America, of which association he was a general officer from the beginning, and became General Secretary in 1896; and he represented that body at the conventions of the American Federation of Labor. In 1904 he resigned office, because of his opposition to the series of strikes begun in New York against the open-shop attitude of the National Clothiers' Association. Mr. White was a member of the National Civic Federation up to the time of his resignation from the United Garment Workers. On the appointment of Governor Roosevelt, he represented the State of New York at the National Trust Conference in Chicago in 1900. He is a member of the New York Ethical Society and an executive member of the Citizens' Union.

Theodore A. Bingham,

who has been Police Commissioner of New York City since 1906, is a graduate of West Point, and was formerly in the United States army, from which he retired in 1904 with the rank of Brigadier-General. While in the army he performed distinguished services as engineer officer and as military *attaché* in various legations.

Mundji Bey Fikri,

a member of an old Turkish family, was born in Constantinople in 1871. His father, Fikri Pasha, was prominent in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ottoman politics. Mundji Bey, after graduating from the College of Political Science *(Mektebee Mulkie)* in 1879, was appointed to a Secretaryship in the Turkish Foreign Office. In 1894 he became Vice-Consul at Athens, and in 1895 he was promoted to the Consulship at Chalcas. In 1897 he came to New York as Consul, and in 1900 he was Consul-General at The Hague. Last year he was appointed Consul-General at New York, and since the establishment of the new *régime* in Turkey he has acted also as *Chargé d'Affaires* at Washington. Mundji Bey has been actively interested in journalistic and literary work. He is the author of a number of novels in the Turkish language.

PERCY MACKAYE

graduated from Harvard University in 1897, and studied at the University of Leipzig from 1899 to 1900. For two years he travelled in Europe, residing in some of the more important cities. Since 1904 he has been engaged in writing plays. Among his best-known works are: "The Canterbury Pilgrims," a comedy; "Fenris the Wolf," a tragedy; "Jeanne d'Arc"; and "Sappho and Phaon," a tragedy.

SALVATORE CORTESI,

a native of Rome, has been engaged for many years in journalism, and his career in that profession has been signalized by a number of brilliant achievements. In 1891, after the memorable lynching of Italians in New Orleans, he came to America as the representative of the "*Tribuna*," the leading Roman paper. He represented the Italian press at the International Press Congresses in Stockholm and Lisbon, and, since 1902, he has been the Chief of the Italian Bureau of the Associated Press. He represented the Associated Press at the Portsmouth Peace Conference, the Morocco Conference at Algeciras, and at the last Peace Congress at The Hague.

JOHN GRIER HIBBEN,

Professor of Logic at Princeton University, was born at Peoria, Illinois, on April 19th, 1861, and graduated from Princeton in 1882. Among his published works are "Inductive Logic," "Deductive Logic," "The Problems of Philosophy" and "Hegel's Logic."

LUCIUS F. C. GARVIN

was born in Knoxville, Tennessee, in 1841, and attended Guilford College in his native State. He graduated from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Amherst College in 1862, and from Harvard Medical School in 1867. During the Civil War he served as a private in the Fifty-first Massachusetts Volunteers. He has resided since 1864 in Rhode Island, to the Legislature of which State he has been elected fifteen times. He was elected Governor of the State in 1902 and 1903.

SYDNEY BROOKS

is an English journalist who has already contributed a number of articles to the REVIEW on a variety of subjects. He visited Ireland last year, and spent a number of months in observing on the spot existing conditions in that country.

CLAYTON HAMILTON

is a graduate of Columbia University, where he has also served as tutor in English. Since 1904 he has lectured extensively on literary topics, and has contributed essays, sketches and stories to the magazines. In collaboration with Miss Grace Isabel Colbron, he produced a play, "The Love that Blinds."

CHRISTIAN GAUSS

was born in 1878 at Ann Arbor, Michigan. He studied at the University of Michigan and in Paris, and subsequently became a member of the faculty of his Alma Mater. At present he is a professor of Romance languages and literatures at Princeton. He has contributed both verse and critical articles to various magazines.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED